



17-5

22

15 Oct

372

Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Case,

DIVISION

SCC

Shelf,

Section

1491

Book,

No.

M^R. HOADLY'S MEASURES OF SUBMISSION TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE

Enquired into, and Disprov'd.

Wherein is shewn that Mr. HOADLY has by no Means proved the lawfulness of forcibly Resisting the Supreme Magistrate in any Case; but after all he has said to the contrary, the Apostle's Doctrine still holds true, That *whosoever Resisteth the Power, Resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that Resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

By a Presbyter of the Church of ENGLAND.
Nathanael Spinckes, M.A.

W^O to all the Princes upon Earth, if this Doctrine [of Resistance] be true, and becometh popular; if the Multitude believe this, the Prince not armed with the Scales of the *Leviathan*, that is, with irresistible Power, can never be safe from the Spears, and Barbed Irons, which their Ambition and presumed Interest will provide, and their Malice will sharpen, and their passionate Violence throw against him. If the Beast we speak of but knows its own strength, it will never be manag'd: Wherefore such as own these Pernicious Doctrines, Destructive to all Societies of Men, may be said to have Wolves Heads, as the Laws of old were wont to speak concerning Excommunicated Persons; and are, like those Ravenous Beasts, so far from deserving our Love and Care, ^{that} They ought to be destroyed at the Common Charge. The Creed of Mr. Hobbes Examined, By his Grace the present Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Edit. 2d. P. 170, 171. Ed. 1. p. 160, 161.

L O N D O N,
Printed for W. Taylor at the Ship in Pater-noster-Row, 1711.

BOOKS Printed for W. Taylor at the Ship in Pater-Noster-Row.

Zeal for the Establish'd Religion Recommended: In a Sermon preach'd at the Assizes held at *Salop*, August 4. 1710. by *Fred. Cornwall*, M. A. Vicar of *Bromfield*. Publish'd at the Unanimous Request of the High Sheriff and the Gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the said County. Price 3d. or 20 s. per Hundred.

Historiæ Sacræ Libri VII. in quibus Narrantur res Geilæ Veterum Patriarcharum, Judæorum, & Christianorum, à primâ Mundi Origine usq; ad excidium Hierosolymitanum. Per *Guil. Nicholsum*. In usum Scholarum Juventutis Christianæ.

Miscellanea Antiqua: Containing (1.) the Life and Death of *K. James V. of Scotland*, in which is the Beginning of the Reformation in that Kingdom: An Account of the Sufferings of the renowned Lady *Jane Douglass*, &c. 2. The Navigation of that King round *Scotland*, the *Orkney* and *Western Isles*, &c. 3. The *Camelion*: Or, Crafty Statesman, by *George Buchanan*: Never before published.

Perspective made Easy: Or, The Art of representing all manner of Objects, as they appear to the Eye, in all Scituations; containing the Elements of Designing and Painting: illustrated with above Fifty Figures in Copper. Written Originally in *French* by *Father Lamy*, and translated by an Officer of Her Majesty's Ordnance.

The Compleat Fencing-Master, by *Sir W. Hope*, Kt. with Cuts.

A Collection of Divine Hymns and Poems on several Occasions. By the Earl of *Roscommon*, Mr. *Dryden*, Mr. *Norris*, Mrs. *Kath. Phillips*, *Philomela*, and others. Published by Mrs. *Singer*; most of them never before Printed.

The Book of Common-prayer, and Administration of the Sacrament, according to the Use of the *Church of England*, with the Apostles, and an Account of the Original of the Fasts and Feasts of the Church, with several of the Rubricks occasionally explain'd. By *William Nichols*, D. D. in 8o. Price 6 s.

Three short Treatises, viz. (1.) A modest Plea for the Clergy. (2.) A Sermon of the Sacerdotal Benediction. (3.) A Discourse to undeceive the People in point of Tithes, &c. Publish'd by Dr. *George Hickes*, in defence of the Priesthood and true Rights of the Church, against the slanderous and reproachful Treatment of the Clergy, in a late Book of pernicious and blasphemous Doctrines, entitul'd, *The Rights of the Church*.

The Path to Liberty: Or, the Method of Man's Redemption, by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: together with Christian Liberty rightly Stated and Maintain'd, against the impious Tenets of Ancient Hereticks, now lately Revived, and with great boldness published by some Modern Writers. By *Tho. Rawbone*, M. A. Late Rector of *Norton under Hamden* in *Somersetshire*. With a Recommendatory Preface by Dr. *Edwards*, Principal of *Jesus College, Oxon.*

T H E

P R E F A C E.

TH O' Mr. *Hoadly's* Principles have not been suffer'd to escape, without some just and pertinent Animadversions upon them, by some of the Learned and more Orthodox Clergy, yet forasmuch as his Celebrated *Measures of Submission* have not hitherto had a particular Answer to them, and himself, and some of his Admirers seem from hence to conclude that Discourse Unanswerable; I have therefore undertaken to shew their Mistake, and do right to a much Injur'd Branch of our Religion, by Rescuing the Apostle's Doctrine, *Rom. 13. 1, 2.* from the forced and unnatural Interpretation there put upon it. Some Mis-representations may be born with, and Errors conniv'd at, whilst the tendency of them appears to have no very dangerous Consequence. But when the Plain, Known, Injunctions of Christianity, that have been taught in Scripture, and owned and practis'd as necessary Duties, both in the Primitive, and our own and
A other

The P R E F A C E.

other Modern Churches, come to be insulted, and the Holy Bible it self is press'd to serve a Party, it is high time to stand up for their Defence against such Assailants. And I am apt to think, it is matter of just Enquiry, why this Book has lain so long unanswered, rather than why I thus appear against it at length.

A Doctrine deliver'd in Scripture, as NONRESISTANCE is, and strongly backed from time to time, both by Arguments and Practice, especially from the Suffering of our Blessed Lord to the end of the Ten Persecutions, I always took to be of such invincible force, that he had need be well fortified, with a fixed Resolution, and good Assurance, to have *robur & as triplex circumpectus*, who should attempt to overthrow it. And I could not but be surpriz'd to see Mr. H. engage in so odd and unchristian an Undertaking, and so Dogmatical and Positive in it, as if he had found out some hidden Stream of Truth, that had run underground for many Ages together, and might have done so still, had not he, and some others of his Complexion, not long since, happily Discover'd the Current, and made a way for its eruption, to the singular Benefit, as they pretend, of all that will partake of it.

Thus

The P R E F A C E.

Thus much himself seems to insinuate, in Answer to his 24th Objection, p. 153, where he Modestly compares himself to the first Reformers, telling us, *There was a time in which any one who having spoken against Transubstantiation, and many other absurd Opinions, would have had the same sort of Objection made against him, as is now against himself.* As also at other times he Triumphantly boasts, * that his Book had been long enough in the World to engage all, who are heartily concerned, against the Principles maintained in it, to endeavour to their utmost to hinder the Pernicious Effects of them, &c. That † not the least Reply had been given to it, besides general and positive Affirmations to the contrary; and again, That || the Replies given by him to every Argument in favour of Absolute Non-resistance, will be esteemed, by all good Judges, a great Advantage to the contrary Cause.

And yet neither is this any new Discovery of his own, but what Junius Brutus, and Doleman, and Buchanan, and Milton, and Sa. Johnson, and other Advocates for Rebellion, as to the main of it, have taught before him, and have been applauded for it by their Party, as well as He. But yet whose Pernicious Principles, have on the

* Pref. to the 2d Edit. p. 1.
Bishop of Exeter's Sermon, p. 10.

† Answer to the Lord
The same Answer p. 51.

The P R E F A C E.

other hand, been so often and fully expos'd, as one would have thought might have effectually prevented any Man of Conscience and Understanding, from ever teaching the same Doctrines more. For thanks be to God, as these Republican Demagogues have in their several times endeavoured to Corrupt the Truth, and lay the Foundation, and spread the Seeds of Treason and Rebellion; so have there not been wanting others of steady loyal Principles, who have had both Will and Ability to Extirpate the Mischievous and Destructive Seeds sown by them, and to *put People in mind*, both of the indispensable Obligation they are under, *to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*, and withal of the great Encouragement they have to depend upon God's Good Providence for Safety and Defence at such times of Fear and Danger, wherein Mr. H. and his Fraternity would persuade them, rather to trust *an Arm of Flesh* than *in the Living God*; to take their Protection out of God's Hands into their own, and rely upon an Unchristian Self-defence, than Patiently take up their Cross, and follow their Lord, through all the Trials and Sufferings he may at any time, in his infinite Wisdom, see fit to exercise them with.

If we regard this World only, I can by no means think the Doctrine of Resistance
to

The P R E F A C E.

to be for the Benefit of Human Society. But when we look forward to another Life, and call to mind the infinite concern we ought all to have for that, and consider withal, how expressly *Resistance of the Higher Powers* is forbidden in Scripture, and what terrible Vengeance is threatned to the Authors of it, it amazes me to find that a Man of Ingenuity, and an appearance of Piety and Sincerity, shou'd ever undertake the Patronage of it.

See how severe a Character the Learned Bishop of *Sarum* gives of such Enemies both to Loyalty and true Religion, how hard a Censure he passes upon Themselves and their Doctrine : * *Amongst all the Heresies this Age has Spawned, there is not one, says his Lordship, more contrary to the whole Design of Religion, and more destructive of Mankind, than is that Bloody Opinion of Defending Religion by Arms, and of Forcible Resistance upon the colour of Religion. The Wisdom of that Policy is Earthly, Sensual, Devilish, savouring of a Carnal, Unmortified, and Impatient Mind, that cannot bear the Cross, nor trust to the Providence of God. And again, † St. Paul's Words in the 13th to the Romans are so express, that methinks they should strike a Terror into all Men from Resisting the Superior Powers, lest*

* *Præf. to the Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland.*

† *First Conference, p. 40.*

The P R E F A C E.

they Resist the Ordinance of God, and receive **Damnation**. And a little after, * *These Words of St. Paul being, as at first addressed to the Romans, so also designed by the Holy Ghost to be a part of the Rule of all Christians, do prove, that whoever hath the Supreme Power, is to be submitted to, and never Resisted.* And again upon another occasion, † *But the same Equality of Justice and Freedom that obliged me to lay open this, ties me to tax all those who pretend a great heat against Rome, and value themselves on their abhorring all the Doctrines and Practices of that Church, and yet have carried along with them one of their most Pestiferous Opinions, pretending Reformation, when they would bring all under Confusion; and vouching the Cause and Work of God, when they were destroying the Authority he had set up, and opposing those impow'ed by him: And the more Piety and Devotion such daring Pretenders put on, it still brings the greater stain and imputation on Religion, as if it gave a Patrociny to those Practices it so plainly Condemns.* This is, Judas like, to kiss our Master when we betray him, and to own a zeal for Religion, when we engage in Courses that disgrace and destroy it. But, Blessed be God, our Church hates and condemns this Doctrine, from what hand

* P. 41. † His Lordship's Sermon at Covent-Garden, of Subjection for Conscience sake, p. 29, 30.

The P R E F A C E.

soever it come, and hath established the Rights and Authority of Princes, on sure and unalterable Foundations, enjoining an intire Obedience to all the Lawful Commands of Authority, and an absolute Submission to that Supream Power, God hath put in our Sovereign's Hands. This Doctrine we justly Glory in, and if any that had their Baptism and Education in our Church, have turned Renegades from this, they proved no less Enemies to the Church her self, than to the Civil Authority. So that their Apostasy leaves no blame on our Church, which Glories in nothing more, than a well-temper'd Reformation, from the later Corruptions, which the dark Ages brought in, to the Pure and Primitive Doctrines which our Saviour and his Apostles Taught, and the first Christians Retained and Practised for many Ages. And again once more, * Above all these we must never forget the Station in which God has put us, as we are Subjects under a Lawful Prince, to whom we are tied both by Divine and Human Laws; and even the Lion's Mouth it self opening to Devour us, can never excuse us from our Obligation to Submit and Suffer, if God had so ordered it by his Providence, that we had not the Blessing of being Born under a Prince, that is the Defender of the Faith; but were born

* Sermon at the Rolls, Nov. 5. 1684. p. 27, 28, 29.

The P R E F A C E.

under one that would deliver us up to the Lion. — When we go out of the way of Patience and Submission, of Obedience and of bearing the Cross ; when we give Scope to Passion and Rage, to Jealousie and Mistrust, and upon this Fermentation in our Minds, we break out into Wars and Rebellions, we forget that the God whom we serve is Almighty, and can save us either from a devouring Fire, or a Lion's Mouth ; and either will save us from these, or reward us infinitely for them : We forget that the Saviour, whom we follow, was made Perfect by Sufferings ; and that we become then truly his Disciples, when we bear his Cross, even tho' we should be crushed under it : We forget that our Religion ought to Inspire us, with a contempt of Life and the World, and with meekness and lowliness of Mind : We forget that we are the Followers of that Glorious Cloud of Witnesses, who have by Faith and Patience inherited the Promises, and have gone to take Possession of the Kingdom that was prepared for them, thro' Fire, and thro' Blood, but it was their own Blood. And to summ up all, we forget that our Reformation was the shaking off of Popery, that is, a Bloody Conspiracy against the Souls and the Bodies of Men, against the Souls of the Weak, and the Bodies of the Firm, but Innocent Professors of this Holy Religion. We are not to share with them in their Cruelty, nor to imitate them in their
Rebellion

The P R E F A C E.

Rebellion. Thus does his Lordship most solidly establish, and emphatically invite to the Practice of what Mr. H. so resolutely and undutifully sets himself to oppose, and which he so industriously decries, * *as a greater opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.*

To the same purpose likewise speaks the late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury Dr. Tillotson, in his Serious and Pathetick Letter to the Lord Russel, Written to his Lordship just before his Death, *out of tender Compassion to his Case, and that he might not leave the World in a Delusion and false Peace, to the hindrance of his Eternal Welfare.* This Letter was Printed for R. Baldwin in 1683. And in it he argues upon the Supposition of *our Religion and Rights being invaded*, and presses my Lord even in this case to consider, *That the Christian Religion doth plainly forbid the Resistance of Authority; adding, That tho' our Religion be established by Law, yet in the same Law which establishes our Religion, it is declared that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever to take up Arms, &c.* Besides that *there is a particular Law declaring the Power of the Militia to be solely in the King; And that ties the Hands of Subjects, tho' the Law of Nature, and the general Rules of Scripture*

* Sermon. p. 8.

The P R E F A C E.

had left us at Liberty, which, says his Grace, I believe they do not; affirming withal, that his Lordship's Opinion [in favour of Resistance] was contrary to the declared Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, and that it deserv'd therefore to be consider'd, how well it would agree with an avowed Asserting of the Protestant Religion, to go contrary to the General Doctrine of Protestants.

I do not aim at more in what I am now contending for, than these Two famous Prelates have so fully and positively Asserted. And so long as I keep to this Point, I hope none who have a Reverence for these great Names, will think me to blame, for undertaking the Defence of Their Doctrine. Mr. *H.* and others of his Principles, may venture to contradict them if they Please, but for my part, I am rather for adhering to what they have Taught, so agreeably to the Precepts of Christianity, and the Doctrine of other Protestants, and the Doctrines and Laws of our own Church and State.

And indeed whatsoever others may judge of Mr. *H.*'s Performance, either in his Sermon, or its Vindication, I see nothing to make me, and I hope I have shewn in the following Tract, that there is no Reason for any one else to doubt, but St. *Paul* both meant as he said, and was
also

The P R E F A C E.

also in the Right, when he taught, that *whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.* And I am moreover humbly of Opinion, with his Grace the Lord Arch-bishop of York, that * **These Words are so plain as to need no Comment.** Nor should they have had any from me, had not Mr. *H*'s undue manner of handling them compell'd me to it.

Mr. *H.* may complain perhaps, that I do not regard what he has said, because in my Paraphrase on the 3d Verse of *Rom.* 13. I affirm *the most outrageous Tyrant to be less Pernicious to any Nation or Kingdom, than a Liberty for every one to do that which is Right in his own Eyes.* But I do assure him, I have seriously consider'd his several Replies to the Fifth Objection, together with his Repetitions of them in other Words in his Preface, *P.* xi, xii, and xxi, xxii, xxiii, and have done it with all the Impartiality I could. And if I have not any where given a particular Answer to what is there advanced, I hope I may fairly be excused, considering that some of it depends only upon Mr. *H*'s bare Assertion, some of it is too hot for my Fingers, and some of it I have actually disproved.

* *Serm. before the H. of Peers, Jan. 30, 1699-1700. p. 20.*

But

The P R E F A C E.

But as to his Doctrine in general, had I no other Argument, as I shall shew I have divers, this alone would be to me an invincible Prejudice against it, that it allows Almighty God so little to do, in the Preservation of the Publick Safety and Happiness. It were well becoming a Divine to *cast his care upon God*, and rely upon him for Protection, and to persuade others, as he has opportunity, to do the same, inasmuch as God has promis'd by his Apostle S. Peter * to take care of those that do so. *Casting all your care upon him*, saith the Apostle, *for he careth for you.*

And there is a particular reason for Dependence upon him in relation to Kingdoms and Nations, because the Present is the only time of Rewarding and Punishing them, as such; forasmuch as all Societies here will be dissolved in the other World, and each one will be to answer for himself consider'd as a single Person, whether a Righteous Man or a Sinner, not as a Member of this or that People or Body of Men. So that Kingdoms and Societies must have their Reward and Punishment in this World, or not at all, since it will be too late for it in the other, when they will be no more. And that they certainly

* 1 S. Pet. 5. 7.

The P R E F A C E.

shall be more or less happy here, accordingly as they take care to serve and please God, or allow themselves to disobey him, he has sufficiently enformed us by his Prophet Jeremiah, † *At what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation, or concerning a Kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; If that Nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a Nation, and concerning a Kingdom, to build and to plant it; If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them.* This therefore is a peculiar reason for depending upon God, for the Preservation of any Community, so long as they make it their business to approve themselves to him in well doing; and is moreover a powerful Encouragement, for submitting to any kind of Tryal he shall think fit to bring us into, in hope of a happy Deliverance in his due time, fully persuading our selves, that whatever temptation befalls us, he will be mindful of us, and if we be not wanting to do our part, *will make a way for our escape, that we may be able to bear it.* This I am very sure is the Deportment that becomes

† Ch. 18. 7, 8, 9, 10.

The P R E F A C E.


Christians under their greatest Fears or Dangers, Pressures or Misfortunes. And it is at any time a far likelier way to a happy settlement, than taking upon our selves to be our own Deliverers, and thereby probably involving our selves in much heavier Miseries than we are labouring to avoid.

And how plausible soever it may appear, to such as have not duly weighed it, no considering Person but must acknowledge it strange for an Ambassador of Jesus Christ, a Preacher of his Gospel, to direct his Auditors or Readers to a quite contrary course, to put them upon such a method of Safety, as favours not of the Spirit of the Gospel, and an *Epicurus*, or a *Macchiavel*, a *Milton*, *Tindal*, or *Toland*, would as readily have directed to. Mr. H. ought to have remembred whose Disciple he professes himself to be, by whose Commission he acts as a Minister, and whose Gospel he is a Minister of; and then he could hardly have forbore to give at least some hint to his Hearers, that they should look up to Almighty God, and have an eye always at his Providence, and not suffer themselves to be affrighted out of their Wits and their Duty, by whatsoever apprehension of Danger, either to Themselves, or the Society they belong to. But the truth is, I can see nothing of this nature in
all

The P R E F A C E.

all his Book; in which I do not remember that he takes notice of the Providence of God, more than once, from one end of it to the other: And then it is not done, as might reasonably have been expected, to recommend the Consideration and Admiration of God's Goodness to his Creatures, and to our selves in particular, but quite the contrary, to caution against relying too easily upon it, with hope of relief when, according to him, there is none to be expected. The Passage here hinted at is p. 70th of his *Vindication*, where treating of the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, he affirms, *it is so far from being true, that this Doctrine would prevent Publick Misery, that it is most evident, the Universal Reception of it could end in nothing but Slavery and Misery upon the present Age, and upon the Generations to come, unless it can be proved, that it is the Custom of Providence miraculously to interpose in the defence of a Nation, which will not defend it self; or to save a People by any other means, but those of Humane Resistance and Opposition.* This is Mr. H's Doctrine. And tho' it is not a proper place for examining the truth of it here, and shewing * what wonderful Deliverances God has oftentimes

* See Dr. Falkner's *Christian Loyalty*. B. 2. Ch. 2. p. 383, &c.



The P R E F A C E.

wrought for his People, both Jews and Christians, and what signal Instances of his Goodness in this kind, we of this Nation have had, for encouraging our Dependance upon him for the future; especially since I shall have another more convenient occasion for it; yet I cannot pass it by without observing how well suited it is to the Genius of this loose, irreligious; atheistical Age. And I do not much wonder that it should be applauded by that sort of Men, when I recollect how agreeable it is to their Principles, or rather want of Principles; inasmuch as themselves would hardly have written otherwise upon the same Argument.

Which I do not mention with any design of charging M. H. with an intent to gratify those avowed Enemies, not only to the Church of *England*, but to Christianity in general, and to all Divine Revelation. For I sincerely profess, I do not suspect him to have had any inclination that way. Only I conceive his Head to have been so full, of his fine Hypothesis, concerning the great need and usefulness of Resistance upon occasion, that he overlook'd this ill effect of it. And I therefore take notice of it here, to the end he may be prevailed with, to consider the matter seriously with himself, and as in the presence of Almighty God,
and

The P R E F A C E.

and try whether he can still satisfy himself, that he has paid that due Deference to Providence, which was to have been expected from a sincere Christian, and one of his Sacred Profession. And could he but be invited, impartially to examine himself in this respect, I cannot but hope he would conclude it more reasonable, for his Scheme of Politicks to be regulated, by the Doctrine of Providence, and the plain Words of his Text, than that this comfortable Doctrine be laid aside, and his Text misinterpreted to make room for That.

It is a very good saying of the late Learned Dean of *S. Paul's*, and not unworthy of Mr. *H's* deliberate Attention; and I leave it with him for that reason. † *When on one side there is a plain and express Revelation of the Will of God, and on the other side some shew and appearance of Reason, I think there can be no dispute which side we chuse; unless a Man think it doubtful, which is the most certain and infallible Rule, Scripture, or meer natural Reason.* This is a Position Mr. *H.* with all his Ingenuity, will never be able to disprove. And yet if it hold true, the necessary consequence of it is, That the Scripture being plainly against Mr. *H's* Doctrine, all his pretended Rea-

† *Case of Resistance*, p. 185.

The P R E F A C E.

sons to the contrary, were they much stronger and better founded than they are, must vail to it. Thus much is undoubtedly owing from him as a Christian.

But then considered as a Preacher of Christianity, it is incumbent upon him to put People in mind of another Life, and press to an especial Regard for it, as our great Concern, and which ought to be the end and aim of all our Endeavours. He should call upon his Followers, and warn them to *give diligence for making their calling and election sure, and working out their Salvation with fear and trembling.* And in any doubtful Case, where the Bounds of their Duty are not so clearly fixed, but that Honest and Good Men may differ in their Sense of it (which is the most Mr. H. can suppose, or desire to be admitted in the matter now under debate) he should admonish them to be very Cautious, lest their Concern for the things of this World tempt them, to what may any way endanger their Eternal Welfare in the other.

Yet if I can understand Mr. H. he has shewn no regard for our better Part, throughout his whole Discourse, in comparison of the Temporal Welfare of Humane Society. The Happiness and Safety of the Publick is the only Cynosure by which he steers his whole course, from his first setting

The *P R E F A C E*.

ting out to the end of it. And to serve this sole end of all his Scheme, he has made it his business to wrest his Text to such a Sense as it can no way bear ; and as, I am confident, he would not have thought it capable of, if he had his thoughts as closely fixed upon the infinite Glories of the other State, as they were upon the Security and Happiness of This. Which is another means whereby he has (I persuade my self unwarily) recommended his Book to the Approbation of the looser sort. And his not foreseeing any such ill consequences of this Procedure, does not make it the less exceptionable in it self, or the less pernicious in its effects ; but it calls loudly upon himself to retract, or at least correct it, so soon as ever he shall be made sensible of it. And I hope, and earnestly beseech him, for his own sake, as well as for the better instruction of such as may have been misled by him, that when he writes again, he will take care to let a little more of the Christian appear in what he writes ; that he will shew some regard to the Promises of the Gospel, and not set up purely for a Politician, and resolve all, as he does at present, into Temporal Safety and Convenience ; and as a Divine, will invite his Readers to a dependance upon God, and a submission to his Will, and an earnest expectation of a

The P R E F A C E.

better state; and will not study so excessively to recommend a concern for the Welfare and Happiness of this World, to such as are too prone to it of themselves, and so have much more need to be put in mind of the other, and excited to a diligent Preparation for it, whatever becomes of themselves, and all they esteem dearest here below.

Such is the gross Corruption of Human Nature, that Mankind are generally more inclinable, to exceed in kindness to their temporal Welfare, than to slight and neglect it. And it is a Preacher of the Gospel's business, to do what in him lies, towards raising up their Affections to the things above, engaging them by all means in their Power, to make sure of a happy Eternity, rather than tell them, how far in his Judgment, they may indulge their present Ease and Quiet, and yet possibly obtain that too. I am sure Mr. *H.* can never be too industrious in recommending the care and love of another Life; but I am sorry to say, that he has shewn too much regard to this, and more I hope than he will suffer himself to shew for the future.

And the rather, if we again take the matter in another view, whereby to see the more clearly, whether he has discharg'd his Office as a Preacher, with all that Fidelity
and

The P R E F A C E.

and Care that was to be expected from him. Now supposing one to excite his Auditors, with all the zeal he can, to be kind and beneficial to their Neighbours, and particularly *to be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate* of the good things God has bless'd them with, for the relief of the sick, the maim'd, the decrepit or any otherwise truly indigent and necessitous ; and another at the same time to employ all his Abilities on the other hand, in encouraging to be saving and tenacious, telling them it is not only *Lawful* but *Glorious* to get Riches by all honest means, and that he who takes not this course to provide for his Family, *has denied the Faith, and is worse than an Infidel*. Suppose again that one earnestly Preaches up the Doctrine of Self-denial and Mortification, or at least, an exact Temperance in all Cases ; whilst another, is earnest in persuading to a free use of God's Blessings, urging to his Auditors, that *every Creature of God is Good, if it be used with Thanksgiving*, and they need not therefore be so abstemious, as some would causelessly advise them to be ; possibly endeavouring moreover to state the Case, what Liberty a Man may take in this respect, and how near he may come to Riot and Excess, without being guilty of the sin of Intemperance. Once more, suppose a Preacher instructing

(a 3)

his

his Auditory in the Duty of Forgiving Affronts and Injuries, and inviting and pressing to the Practice of it, begging of them diligently to attend to, and constantly keep in mind, those Words of our Blessed Saviour, *St Matt. 6. 14, 15, If ye forgive Men their Trespases, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you, But if ye forgive not Men their Trespases, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your Trespases*; and suppose at the same time, another teaching the inconvenience of such a meek Passive Deportment, and that the certain effect of it, will be, that *veterem ferendo injuriam invitabunt novam*, they must expect to be so much the more insulted for it, and studiously informing them in what instances he fancies, they may lawfully take upon them to right themselves, how far they may possibly go, in Judging and Punishing the Injurious Persons, and exhorting by no means to be afraid or cautious, but freely to use all the Liberty he allows them in this respect. I presume no one will think it difficult to determine, whether Sort of these Preachers, are most likely to prepare their Hearers for the Kingdom of Heaven; which of them best answer the Design of our Saviour's Commission to Preach the Gospel, and are like to see most fruit of their Labour, in a Licentious Age, wherein every Concession is apt to be stretch'd

stretch'd beyond all reason, in favour of Mens Lusts, Passions, and Worldly Interests.

Indeed, were Mankind so over zealous in the performance of their Duty, as to need a Caution to be given them, That they do not inconsiderately run themselves upon unnecessary Difficulties and Inconveniencies, like such of the Ancient Martyrs, as voluntarily exposed themselves to the fury of their Persecutors, when not sought for by them, it might be fit to take off the edge of their Zeal, and let them know they might possibly serve the ends of Religion better, by sparing themselves, to do good in their Generation, and influence others who have great need of such Examples, to excite them to the ways of Holiness.

But alas! whosoever observes the lamentable state of this remiss degenerate Age, must inevitably be sensible how little occasion there is for this sort of Doctrine: And that all the most Indefatigable endeavours of the most pious and laborious Preachers are not enough to engage the Generality of those that call themselves Christians, even to the lowest pitch of true Godliness and Virtue; and that therefore all attempts of this nature are of a very dangerous consequence, tho' the Preacher be so *cautious and prudent*, as really to recommend nothing but what in

The P R E F A C E.

it self is lawful. But if he happen to exceed in the Liberties he allows, and so invites, and earnestly encourages to the Practice of what is sinful, especially if he set up Notions of his own in direct opposition to his Text, and other parts of the Holy Scripture, how dreadful must his account be at the last day, tho' he had not been conscious to himself of any ill design in what he did? This Question I would beg leave to recommend to Mr. H's. Consideration. And when he has decided it, he may please to apply it, and see if himself be no way concern'd in it.

That his Doctrine is false, I promise my self I shall have fully evinced, before I have finished this undertaking. At present I would offer these following Considerations, which seem to me to serve in a good measure towards the deciding this Controversy :

I. Upon Mr. H's. Principle no General of an Army can have a Power of commanding his Soldiers upon any desperate Engagement or Attack, because their ** Good cannot be the same with any thing inconsistent with it, with the private Advantage of their General, or with the imaginary Interest of any Person whatsoever, who is attempting the Destruction*

** Pref. p. 8.*

The P R E F A C E.

of it. If it be said, what they are put upon is for the Good not of the General only, but the Publick, and what they must be supposed to have oblig'd themselves to, when they were Lifted into their Countries service ; Mr. H. could easily reply to this, that themselves are to judge whether this service be for their Countries Good ; and again, whether they are not to have a greater concern for their own Safety, to which the great Duty of Self-preservation calls upon them to have an especial regard. He could tell them, *it is their * indispensable Duty to submit to such Commanders as answer the good End of their Institution, such as promote the Good of those that are under them, and are continually attending upon this very thing.* But if these Commanders seek the hurt of the Army, by putting them upon such hard Services as in all appearance tend to their inevitable Destruction, to oppose them in this Case cannot be to oppose a just *Authority: Nay a Passive Non-Resistance,* but especially a quiet and ready Submission and Obedience to such unreasonable Commands, would appear upon examination, to be a much greater opposition *to the Will of God than the contrary;* And as for any Contract made at their Entrance into the Service,

* *Serm. p. 7.*

The. P R E F A C E.

this is always to be understood to mean, only so far as might be just and reasonable, and for their own and the Publick Benefit and Advantage. Neither of which ends they can imagine to be answer'd, by the loss of so many brave Men as are like to fall in the Attempt required of them. Wherefore they cannot see, how they are any way oblig'd to it; and if they run upon an unnecessary danger and die by it, their Blood will be upon their own Heads. And so under a Notion of preserving their Lives, the Publick comes to be deprived, and possibly may be entirely ruined for want of their Assistance in a time of great Danger and Distress. Yet this, as unreasonable as it is in it self, and as disadvantageous as it may prove to the Publick, I take to be one necessary Consequence of Mr. H's Doctrine. Another is, that,

2. This Doctrine Condemns the state of Slavery, as utterly Unlawful. Tho' not only our Blessed Saviour no where condemns it, * even when he has occasion to speak of it, but his Apostle St. Paul evidently allows of it as lawful, 1 Cor. 7. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. *Let every man abide in the same calling, wherein he is call'd. Art*

* Particularly St. Matt. 24. 50, 51.

The P R E F A C E.

thou called being a Servant; that is, a Slave; care not for it; but if thou mayst be made free, use it rather, &c. Here St. Paul allows of such a state of Bondage, and admonishes those that were in it, not to look upon themselves as any way Discharg'd from it by their embracing Christianity. But it is a difficult matter to reconcile this Admonition of the Apostle, with Mr. H's. notion of Public Good, and the Resistance he recommends in order to it. For according to his way of arguing, How can it be for the Good of Mankind, that such great Numbers as were in Slavery heretofore, and are still in some places, should be subjected to the will of one Man, to Tyrannize over them, to maintain them as he pleases, even like the *Prodigal Son* in our Saviour's Parable, who * desired to feed with the Swine upon their Husks, and no Man gave unto him; (a) to Condemn them to the hardest Labour, and (b) Chain them to it, (c) to Stigmatize them, (d) to Crucify them

* St. Luke 15, 16.

(a) Tu te in pistrinum. *Plaut. Epid. Act. 1. sc. 2.* Quid causæ est, quin hinc in pistrinum rectâ proficiscar viâ? *Terent. Andr. Act. 3. sc. 4.*

(b) Quid suadet juveni lætus stridore catenæ? *Juv. sat. 14.*

(c) Uritur ardenti duo propter lintea ferro. *Ibid.*

(d) *Lips. de Cruce, cap. 10.* Quid meritis? *Crucem. Ter. Andr. Act. 3. sc. 5.*

and

The P R E F A C E.

and **Διχολονία*, to Cleave them in two? What Reason cou'd there be, that *Crassus* should have had Ten or Twelve Thousand Persons thus perfectly at his Disposal? Was this for the Welfare and Happiness of Mankind? † Tamely to sit still, and see the Happiness of so large a Body of Men thus *entirely* Ruin'd, and Sacrific'd to the irregular Will of one Man, seems a greater contradiction to the Will and Design of God, than any Opposition can be; For it is a tacit consent to the Ruin and Misery of Mankind. This Naturally follows from Mr. H's. way of arguing; and by this time he may see it reaches farther than, I believe, he ever design'd it should. Neither our Saviourⁿ nor his Apostles ever condemn'd a State of Slavery as intolerable in it self, or inconsistent with a Profession of Christiani-

* *Διχολονία, ἀναισθησις*, Hefych. And not only Dr. Whitby upon the Place, has learnedly shewn, this to be a usual sort of Death, in several other Cases; but our Blessed Lord applies it particularly to Slaves as a Punishment their incensed Masters had a Power of executing upon them, St. Matt. 24. 51. Where speaking of the disorderly Servant, who began to quarrel with his Fellow-Servants, and to Eat and Drink with the Drunken, he foretells that the Lord of that Servant will come in a Day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and will cut him in sunder, and give him his Portion with the Hypocrites, &c.

† *Serm.* p. 8.

The P R E F A C E.

ty, as I have observed; but plainly allow of it as lawful. Yet I cannot see how Mr. *H.* can prove it to be for the Benefit and Happiness of Mankind; or how he can admit of the Lawfulness of it, if it be not.

If it be said, these Slaves were the Purchase of their Owners, and so were their proper Goods, and there is therefore a great difference betwixt the case of such, and that of Subjects, who * *generally speaking, are not in a State of Captivity, never forfeited their Lives and Fortunes to their Prince; nor ever were bought with a price into their Arbitrary Power; I grant it.* But then I would ask, Is it for the Good of Mankind, that so great a part of them should be thus, enthrall'd, and oftentimes to very Cruel and Tyrannical Lords? Why then should not these poor Enslaved Persons resist their Inhumane Masters, and violently shake off their Yoke, and set themselves free? Why should they not endeavour to release themselves of so disagreeable a Service? Why should they not raise another *Bellum Servile* in their own defence, whensoever they find themselves strong enough, like that amongst the Ro-

* *Vindication*, p. 129.

The P R E F A C E.

mans mentioned † by *Florus*? Why should not they all joyn together to regain their lost Liberty, and not Suffer themselves to be Tyrannized over in so Mercilefs a manner? If they were bought, what right had they who sold them, to make Merchandize of them? Was it for the good of Mankind that one part of them should have such Power over the other? Or if they were fairly and justly bought, and so their Services due to the Purchaser; yet what right did this give the Purchaser, to Tyrannize over them so excessively, as too commonly was done? The *Romans*, after the fatal Battle at *Canna*,* were forced to Arm no less than Eight Thousand Slaves at once; and what Reason had these ever to lay down their Arms, and return to their Slavery? According to Mr. *H*'s Doctrine, it will be impossible to give a Reason, why they might not have combined together to cast off their hard-hearted Masters; who though they had purchased them to themselves, stood obliged however to use them with Gentleness and Humanity! † Yet tho' they abused them, beat them, Wounded, ay, and Killed them too, only for their own humour, I do not remember in Scripture, says the Lord Bishop of Exon;

† L. 3. C. 19. * Liv. l. 22. c. 57. † Answer to Mr. H's Letter, p. antepenult.

The P R E F A C E.

and very truly, any express Allowance, much less Encouragement, given to Slaves to rise up against, or strike their Masters, and much less to knock them on the Head for Publick Good ; i. e. to release themselves and their Fellow-Servants from an unreasonable and intolerable Servitude. In short, Slavery is certainly consistent with a Profession of Christianity, and the Precepts of the Gospel ; tho' I cannot see how it is with the Doctrine of Mr. H.

3. This Doctrine of Mr. H. suits not with one Principal part of the Magistrate's Office, which is to defend his Subjects, as from the Invasion of Foreigners, so likewise from the violence of their Fellow-Subjects, and the Wrongs and Injuries one might be apt to do to another. He is to take care to preserve Peace, and execute Justice, by vindicating the Innocent and the Oppressed, and Punishing all sorts of Malefactors. All which it will be out of his Power to do, if once his People come to rise up against him, and either seize his Person and keep him in hold, or proceed Barbarously to take away his Life, as it befell Good K. *Charles I.* or else put him to Flight for his Safety, which was the Case of King *Charles II.* after *Worcester-Fight*. Either of these ways the Prince is totally disabled from giving that Protection which is due from

The P R E F A C E.

from him to his trueſt and moſt faithful Subjects. And at a time too when they have moſt need of a Defender from the Outrages of their ill-affected Neighbours. For it is very rarely that a whole Nation joyn together to caſt off their Sovereign ; but moſt uſually a conſiderable part adhere to him, and chooſe rather to riſk their Fortunes with him, than break through all the ties both of their Natural and Sworn Allegiance. And then the Nation muſt be expected to become a meer *Aceldama*, a place of Blood and Slaughter, and of Rapine and Robbery, as was too ſadly viſible in in our own Land during the Reigns of the Three *Henry's*, and again in the laſt Century betwixt Forty One, and Sixty ; when the King could neither protect himſelf, nor the beſt of his Subjects, but ſome were Slain in Battle, others put to Death as Traytors, only for aſſiſting their Lawful Sovereign according to their bounden Duty of Allegiance ; and the great Arch-biſhop *Laud*, tho' no way Guilty of Treason, was however Tried and Executed for it, * in defiance of the King's Pardon, ſent him in order to his better ſecurity ; but which in thoſe miſerable Circumſtances, proved of no Advantage to him. So that this method

* *Ld. Clarendon's Hiſtory: B. 8. To. 2. p. 442.*

of Resistance must ordinarily be expected to rob, not only the Prince of his Power of Protecting his Subjects against each other, but a great part of the Subjects too, of their Quiet and Safety, their just Possessions, and, it may be, of their Lives. And whether this be not far worse than bearing with many instances of Tyranny from a Prince that really *does not attend continually to the end of his Institution*, or perhaps only with some Errors in one who is but suspected not to do it, I need not tell Mr. H. or any Man of Understanding. If he say, this is not always the effect of that Resistance he pleads for, neither do I say it is. It is enough for my purpose, and too much for him to Answer, that it is most commonly so, and very rarely happens otherwise, as all Histories testify. And this is a sufficient Indication, that Resistance, as it is an Ungodly, is likewise a very dangerous and destructive Remedy, and by no means adviseable to those who have any regard for the Welfare ~~of~~ either of Soul or Body.

4. This Resistance Mr. H. *so Cautiously and prudently*, but in truth so Zealously and Vehemently contends for, is no less than a total Subversion of the Constitution. For by making the Prince accountable to the People, it Places the last Resort in Them, and so robs the Crown of its Supremacy,

The P R E F A C E.

and transfers it to the Subjects, as if the Prince were not God's Minister, but Theirs, to whom according to Mr. H. He is responsible for his Misgovernment ; in direct opposition to the Laws and Frame of our Constitution, and particularly to all those Statutes that declare the King or Queen, to be the only Supreme Governor of these Realms, and that the Power of the *Militia* is solely in Him.

5. It is not only a Contradiction to our own Government, and the Laws of our Particular Country, but to Government in general, which is entirely supplanted by it, whilst it lasts, and possibly may never recover it self more. For Government, as Sir *Dudley Diggs* observes, * is the effect not of a Peoples divided natural Powers, but as they are united and made one by Civil Constitution. Which Union is again dissolv'd, whensoever the Subjects take upon them to oppose their Sovereign, and to act, as they always do in these Cases, not by any stated Laws, but by what themselves are pleas'd to call the Law of Necessity. So that their own Will and Power is their only Law, against which no Redress is to be had, either for their Sovereign, or their Fellow-subjects, any farther than themselves shall please.

* *Unlawfulness of a Subject's taking up Arms, &c.* p. 7.

The P R E F A C E.

*This Principle, as the aforementioned Author speaks, * makes our Strifes and Debates endless, all our Laws would be writ in Blood ; it breaks in sunder all the Bonds, with which the goodly frame of Government is Knit together, and robs us of our Peace under Anarchy and Confusion. Thus the Constitution is ruin'd for the present. And tho' things do oftentimes recover at length their Ancient State, and run in their former Channels ; yet that they shall do so, is more than any one can be sure of, or than, I believe, Mr. H. with all his Caution and Prudence, will venture to undertake for. For tho' when once the Chief Actors in the Rebellion, are satiated with Blood and Rapine, they will find it necessary, in order to the preservation of what they have possess'd themselves of, and the ease and safety of their own Persons, to fall again into some sort of Government, yet into what sort, it is as impossible to foretell, as it is to foresee to what a degree their Fellow-subjects will Suffer by them. So that the People have no security that their Ancient Government shall ever be restored, when thus Unhing'd and Overthrown ; nor do they know what, or when any other Settlement will succeed in lieu of it. Which is a matter of great impor-*

The P R E F A C E.

tance, and deserves Mr. *HP*'s most serious and deliberate Consideration, before he undertake to raise a Commotion, that for ought he knows, may have different effects from, perhaps quite contrary to what, he seems to promise himself from it.

6. Whereas Mr. *H.* maintains that* *Governors are placed in Authority only in order to the Publick Happiness of Mankind; and that if they use their Power to any other purpose, to the Hurt and Prejudice of Humane Society, a Passive Non-resistance would in these Cases appear, upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God than the contrary; hence it necessarily follows, That he must either allow Men to live in a known Opposition, a highly Offensive, a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, or else according to him they must be bound to Resist in all instances, wherein the Prince Deflects from his Duty, or indeed wherein they but imagine him to do it. They must, I say, in all these instances be ready to resist, without staying till things come to extremity, as they would avoid the Guilt of this much greater Opposition to the Divine Will. Which is a Doctrine that not only contradicts his own Profession, that he is for no Resistance but where the Society*

The P R E F A C E.

is ruined without it; but besides, if put in Practice, must inevitably ruine all the Societies in the World, must turn all into Anarchy and Confusion, and many times purely upon groundless Fears and false Suggestions. Such a delicate Scheme has Mr. *H.* laid in order to the Happiness of his Disciples here in this World, besides the *Damnation* that is threatned to them in the next.

7. And lastly, This Doctrine of Mr. *H.* leaves but one sort of Government in the World. All that have Written of Politics have owned, three different Species of Governments, Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy; but if Mr. *H.* be in the Right, these have all been in the Wrong. For he resolves the Chief Authority into the People, by directing the last Appeal to them; as who, according to him, have the Power of calling their Governors, whosoever they be, to an account, and of deposing them, and so divesting them of all their Authority, whensoever they shall think fit. Which makes the Government in reality a Democracy, or in *Aristotle's* Phrase, an Ochlocracy, whatsoever else it were design'd to have been, or by whatsoever Names it may be called.

All I design farther in this Preface, is only to remind Mr. *H.* of some Exceptions that

The P R E F A C E.

that have formerly been made to his Doctrine ; and still call for an Answer from him. He makes a fair profession of his Care to silence whatsoever had any way been urged against him; *I have not, says he, * esteemed it for the Interest of Truth, or for the Advantage of the Cause I have espoused, to neglect any thing that carries with it, any seeming Contradiction, either to the main Principle I defend, or to any Reasoning by which I have defended it ; whether privately or publickly advanced.* Yet tho' what has been *privately* Suggested, I cannot say ; I am much Mistaken, if several things have not been offered *publickly*, that have hitherto received either no Answer at all from him, or such as does by no means come up to the Point. Amongst the former of which I reckon these:

1. † *It is the Will of God, Men should use the Riches and Honour he gives them, for the good of Mankind ; but does it follow that a Wicked Man forfeits his Estate and Title, because he abuses them?* Namely, by not doing that good with them which he ought, Possibly sometimes by doing the greater Mischief to his Neighbours; But more usually by indulging himself in Looseness and Debauchery, to the Dishonour of Almigh-

* Pref. p. 4.
just. p. 12.

† Enquiry into the Liberty of the Sub-

The P R E F A C E.

ty God, and the Ruine of himself, both Soul and Body. Every one knows this is no Cause of Forfeiture, any otherwise than as he may in some Cases incurr Legal Penalties. Let him but keep from this, and he may spend his Days in Riot, and Excess, and gross Uncharitableness, without losing his Right and Title to his Estate, whilst it is not spent or sold. Why then should my Prince's Misgovernment forfeit his Title to his Dominions? To this Mr. H. has not said a Word that I could observe.

2. * *Nebuchadnezzar was a proud and wicked King, and a great Oppressor of God's People ; and yet he calls him his Servant, and Commands the Jews, and other Nations, to submit to his Yoke.* This was alledged to prove that *Wicked Princes do not cease to be God's Ministers.* But without any Reply that I can find.

3. Again says the same Author, † *If the Apostle at first presses Obedience and Non-resistance in unlimited Words, for Fashion sake, and yet afterwards limits it in such a manner, as that the Rulers in whose Reign he wrote, and their Successors for above Two Hundred years afterwards, could take no Benefit by it ; for what did it serve but to delude them ? Whilst he delivers his Precepts with an Am-*

* Ibid.

† P. 13.

The P R E F A C E.

bignity besitting the Oracle at Delphos, but not at all agreeable to the Majesty and Simplicity of the Oracles of God. Of this likewise Mr. H. takes no notice.

4. Thus also speaks another Author, * *Suppose a Justice of Peace should send an Innocent Man to Prison, or a Constable set a Man in the Stocks that was quietly walking along the Streets; and suppose them Guilty of numerous repeated Acts of this Nature, to the disturbance of the Publick Peace, yet it is plain their Office does not determine thereupon. The one is still a Justice, the other a Constable, and tho' they, in the Execution of their Office, act against Law, yet they are Magistrates by Law, and are invested with the King's Authority. Even so when a bad Prince takes unwarrantable Measures, contrary to the true Interest and Happiness of his People, and by so doing betrays his Trust, and goes directly opposite to the Law of God, he is notwithstanding the Minister of God, and such a one too, for all Mr. H. to whom St. Paul in this Chapter enjoyns the People to submit, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake. Which was so pat an Illustration, that one would have thought Mr. H. could not well overlook it; but however he has thought fit to say nothing to it.*

Of the latter, I shall give only this single Instance. † It was objected, that to make

* St. Paul no mover of Sedition, p. 7. † Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject. p. 2. Mis-

The P R E F A C E.

Mismanagement a forfeiture of the Supreme Government, it was necessary, that God should have somewhere declar'd such Abuse of the Power to be a forfeiture of it; and that upon such forfeiture it escheats to the People. And to confirm this last condition, it follows, *For you know that tho' a Man has forfeited his Life, yet if any one takes the forfeiture without lawful Authority, he is a Murderer both by the Law of God, and the Law of the Land.* And to the same purpose, † *Thou shalt not kill, is one general Rule for the Publick Good: But if a Man is ever so ill an Instrument, or Mischievous to the Publick, this Commandment may not therefore be broken to get rid of him, on pretence that the Breach in this Case, better serves the Publick, than the keeping thereof doth.* The plain meaning of both which Authors is, that how justly soever a Malefactor has forfeited his Life, none but the Magistrate can take it from him; and if any do it without his appointment, he is a Murderer, not only in the Sight of God, but in the Sense of the Law. Now to the Objection Mr. H. has said nothing that I observe. To the Reason forenforcing it he has offered at a Reply; but which is as good as none. * *We know, says he, and see, that it hath been allowed in all Governments, to get rid of such Men by putting 'em to Death.*

† *Plea for the Publick Good*, p. 6.

‡ *Pref.* p. 14.

Which

The P R E F A C E.

Which is no more than what the Objectors themselves suppose. But how is this to be done? By none but the Magistrate, say they. *The Magistrate is to do it*, says Mr. H. But as to the Plea that a Private Man may not do it, though to deliver the Publick from such a Corrupt and Destructive Member; to this he says not one Word. He argues that the Magistrate's Executing Offenders is no breach of the General Rule, *Thou shalt not kill*; and pleads for self-defence against any that shall unjustly Assault my Life; but not a Word of the Power, of Publick Good to warrant the taking away a Criminal's Life by a Private Hand. Though this was the only point he was concerned to speak to. Yet if Publick Good will not warrant the taking away such an unsound and dangerous Member any other way, than as the Law directs, it is strange to think that it should Authorize the expelling or Murdering the Supreme Governor, against the Laws both of God and Man.

The Reader is desired to take Notice, that my References to Mr. H's. Measures of Submission, are Paged according to his First Edition, except only in the Preface; and that if sometimes I mention the King only, (as he oftentimes does) I would be understood to mean however either King or Queen.

THE CONTENTS.

The INTRODUCTION.

Shewing the Design of Mr. H's. Sermon, and its Vindication, and of this Answer to them, Page 1. As also how well Mr. H's. Doctrine agrees with that of St. Paul, p. 3. And the Method of the ensuing Answer, p. 6.

PART I.

Containing a Disproof of Mr. H's. Argument, for Resistance, p. 7. Where the Reader may see the several Propositions he undertakes to maintain, p. 9.

CHAP. I.

Whether bare Possession of the Throne gives a Right to the Subjects Allegiance, p. 10. Mr. H's. first Position, *ibid.* Which is proved Unreasonable, p. 12. Unjust, p. 13. Subversive of our English Constitution, p. 17. And contrary to the Holy Scripture, p. 21. Some Objections Answer'd, p. 23.

CHAP. II.

Whether a bad Governor cannot be that Minister, to whom St. Paul requires Submission and Obedience? p. 31. Mr. H's Second Position, *ibid.* Wherein he contradicts St. Augustin and others of the Fathers; p. 32. And the Doctrine of the Scriptures, p. 33. Some Objections considered, p. 37.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. III.

Whether the Higher Powers are from God, only so far as they act agreeably to his Will, and study to promote the Happiness of Humane Society? p. 46. Mr. H's. Third Position, ibid. Disproved from the Instance of Husband and Wife, p. 47. Of Masters and Servants, p. 49. Of a General, a Judge, and a Mayor, p. 51. Of a Minister of the Gospel, p. 52. And of a Viceroy, p. 53. An Objection from the end of Government considered, p. 54. Another from Nero, p. 55. Another from our Saviour calling Herod Fox, and St. Paul's saying he was deliver'd out of the Mouth of the Lion, p. 57. And another from David's carriage towards Saul, ibid. The Doctrine of one of our Homilies in this respect, p. 64.

CHAP. IV.

Whether it be not only Innocent, but Honourable and Glorious, to rise up against a Prince, that attends not to the End of his Government, p. 67. Mr. H's. Fourth Position answered, ibid.

CHAP. V.

Whether the Peace and Happiness of Mankind be the Sole end of Government? p. 70. Mr. H's. last Position; against which is shewn First, That the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind is not the sole end of Government, ibid. For another is, To Represent God Almighty to the People, p. 70. And another, To take care of God's Worship and Service, p. 74. And yet if it were, this would not prove the Lawfulness of Resisting the Higher Powers, p. 76. The Plea of Publick Good debated, p. 79.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS:

C H A P. VI.

Whether Mr. H. has been so Prudent and Cautious in Preaching this Doctrine, as he professes himself to have been? p. 91. Whether he has been as cautious as the Apostle St. Paul was? ibid. Mr. H. owns a remarkable difference betwixt the Apostle's Words and his Explication of them, p. 100. He lays before the Reader the Words in which he has expressed his own Sense, 106.

C H A P. VII.

Whether Mr. H. has faithfully expounded the Words of the Apostle, Rom. 13. 1, &c. p. 113. Some Observations upon Mr. H's. Exposition, p. 115. Another Exposition in lieu of his, p. 119.

C H A P. VIII.

Whether Mr. H's. several Arguments do sufficiently disprove the Doctrine of Non-Resistance, p. 124. First from Nero, and the Roman Emperors, ibid. Then from the Jews, p. 127. And from those who acknowledged no Submission due to Governors in point of Conscience, p. 128. From the Jews again, ibid. From the Romans, ibid. From the Happiness of Humane Society, p. 130. From the Reasoning of St. Paul, Rom. 13. p. 131. From the Restrictions necessarily to be allowed in divers places of Scripture, ibid. And particularly with respect to the Case of Private Injurious Persons, p. 134. From the Limitation of Active Obedience, p. 139. From the Authority of the Lowest Magistrate, p. 140. From St. Paul's Behaviour towards the Magistrates at Philippi, p. 141. And his not appealing to Rom. 13. for his own Vindication, ibid. And lastly from St. Paul's method of procedure in this Chapter, p. 142. The Conclusion of this First Part, p. 145.

E R R A T A.

ERRATA in the first Part.

PAge 14. l. 34. for a r. and. l. 38. for c. 7. r. *Reports*.
l. 7. p. 15. l. 11. for *that* r. *the*. p. 16. l. 6. r. and
all. p. 19. l. 18. r. *Ed. III.* p. 32. l. 10. r. *Vespasians*. p. 43.
l. 30. d. an. p. 45. r. *Chap. III.* p. 47. l. 28. r. *impietates*. p. 56.
l. 29. r. *Neronis 2do. Origenes*. p. 62. l. 4. d. of. p. 67. l. 37. r.
unusual. p. 71. l. 34. r. * *Beza*. l. 38. for many, r. any. p. 72. l. 26.
r. *Words run*. p. 71 l. 21. r. *Parliament is* p. 73. l. 14. r. *choofe*.
p. 75. p. 12. r. *Image*. p. 78. l. 13. r. *Council*. p. 82. l. 9. for *be* r.
were. p. 83. l. 19. for *is*, r. *in*. p. 86. l. 38. for *hasty*, r. *happy*. p.
90. l. 22. for *well*, r. *evil*. p. 91. r. *Chap. VI.* p. 93. l. 7. r. *lies*. p.
113. l. 21. for *that*, r. *than*. p. 116. l. 13. r. *justify*. p. 133. l. ult.
r. *ἐκκλῆσιαν*. p. 140. l. 11. r. *inferring*. p. 142. l. 20. r. *yet*.

Mr. *HOADLY*'s

MEASURES of SUBMISSION

Enquired into, and Disprov'd.

The INTRODUCTION.

MR. *Hoadly*, having had sufficient Time to reflect upon the Intemperance and Indecency of his *Preface*, especially as coming from a great Pretender to Calmness and Moderation; I am willing to hope he has seriously consider'd it, and repented of it: And the rather, because of his having left it out of the second Edition of his Book. And for this Reason I shall pass it over; tho' some perhaps will think he ought not only to have laid it aside, but to have made some Acknowledgment of the Indignity offer'd in it, to a very venerable Body of Men.

As also I shall take the less Notice of the Sermon, because the Sum and Purport of it is more fully contained, in the *Vindication* I am now to examine.

The principal, I may say, the only Design of which, as well as of the Sermon, being to palliate, justify, and recommend the great Sin of *Resisting the higher Powers*, whenever they shall prove to be such as the Apostle, in the Text, more particularly required to *be subject to*, such I mean, as the *Roman Emperors* about that Time were: I shall therefore apply my self to shew the Inconsistency of Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine with the Apostle's, and the terrible Danger to which those expose themselves, who are unfortunately ensnared by it.

And in truth, it is no light Charge I have against this unchristian Doctrine, but such as is weighty and home, and would be thought abundantly sufficient in any other Case: For, 'tis a Doctrine that has both Divine and Humane Testimony against it, and I might add, the Dictates of right Reason too, but that I design to be very sparing in this respect, to keep within the Limits of my own Profession, and to such Arguments as Religion suggests, together with what the Laws of the Land enjoin, a Submission to which in all things lawful, is certainly taught by our Religion, and which are therefore the proper Boundaries of our Loyalty and Obedience. These Mr. *H.* cannot deny to be expressly against him, and * is forced therefore to fly to the Shelter of I know not what *old Laws*; nor is he pleased to tell us what they are. Only it seems somebody has told him, that in our Law, (that is to say, in *Bracton*, l. 3. c. 9. *de legibus, & consuetudinibus Angliae*,) the King is declared to be the Minister of God, only as he performs the positive Will of God, by doing all manner of good Services to his People; and that when he attempts their Ruin, and declines to Injustice and Oppression, he becomes the Minister of the Devil. A rare hearsay-Story to be set up in Confutation of our positive known Statutes! which are so expressly against him, that he dares not so much as mention any of them; but instead of them, pretends to have heard,

* *Vindication*, p. 212, 213, 214.

tho' we must not know from whom, of an *old Law* of his Side; tho' where this *old Law* is to be found, since *Bracton* had no Power of making Laws, is as difficult to discover, as who the Person was that told him of it. But no matter for that, *he has been told it*, and that must be thought enough to overbear all the Authority of the Statute-book to the contrary; which is just the same wise way of arguing, as if a *Papist* being urged with the Second Commandment, against the worshipping of Images, should return for answer, that he did not well understand these Commandments, but he had been told by a certain devout Man, that there was an older Commandment for the Worship of them. The Argument is exactly parallel, and yet I am pretty confident, Mr. *H.* would not allow of this as a good Plea; but would condemn it, on the contrary, as one of the weakest that ever was used.

At this rate Mr. *H.* may preach rebellious Sermons, and print as many Vindications of them as he pleases, and plead the Laws of Nature, and other old unknown Laws on his Side, as long as he thinks good; yet so long as the Laws of the Land are positively against him, a good Subject would think himself obliged to give very little heed to him, tho' these Laws were only not contradictory to the Law of God.

But if they moreover, have the Gospel of their side, and not only do not contradict, but on the contrary are intended to enforce the Observation of its Injunctions, by making that Disobedience severely punishable here, which the Apostle declares to be eternally punishable hereafter, How ill must it become a Preacher of Christianity to set up his antisciptural, unknown, *old Laws*, in Defiance to our later Statutes, as well as the ancients Doctrines of the Law, well known and well agreeing with the Precepts of the Gospel?

The Apostle requires, that we * *put People in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to*

* Tit. 2. 1.

obey Magistrates. And Mr. *H.* would have done much better to have followed this Apostolical Canon, and taught his Hearers and Readers what Submission God requires of them, to their Sovereign, than to instill such Principles into them, as necessarily tend to the Subversion of all Government, which can never be safe, where such anti-monarchical and treasonable Notions prevail.

Mr. *H.* must needs own that *Tiberius* was the *Higher Power* at *Rome*, when our blessed Saviour was crucified, and *Claudius* and *Nero* when the Apostles wrote their Epistles. He must own likewise, that these were not such excellent Governors, as to whom alone he pleads Obedience to be due. He must own farther, that one of these was certainly the *Power* then *in Being*, when the Epistle to the *Romans* was written. And then I would be glad to learn of him how his Doctrine and St. *Paul's* can possibly be reconciled. St. *Paul* * teaches, that the *Powers* that then were, *were ordained of God*, and consequently his Vicegerents. Mr. *Hoadly* affirms on the contrary, † that if Princes use their Power to the Hurt and Prejudice of human Society, which very few have ever done more than these, they cannot be called God's Vicegerents, without the highest Profaneness.

Again, || *Whosoever resisteth the Power*, even in the Time of those wicked Emperors; for it is not whosoever shall at any Time hereafter, when there may happen to be a good Prince, but even now, under such as then were, in the present Tense; *Whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God*, is St. *Paul's* Doctrine. But this will not go down with Mr. *H.* and therefore he tells us, that * to oppose them (who seek the Hurt of human Society, to oppose them in such Cases) cannot be to oppose the Authority of God: Nay, a passive Non-resistance would appear, upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.

* *Rom.* 13. 1. † *p.* 8. || *v.* 2. * *Ibid.*

Once more, v. 5. *Ye must needs be subject*, says the Apostle, *not only for Wrath*, or out of fear of being punished by the Magistrate, *but also for Conscience Sake*, that is, out of regard to Almighty God, who has required it at your Hands, and will be sure (as is declared at the Second Verse of that Chapter) to punish the Neglect of it with everlasting *Damnation* in the other World. But to this Mr. Hoadly has a Reply ready at hand, namely * *That there is an indispensable Duty upon all, Subjects as well as others, to regard the publick Interest; and if their Submission help to destroy and ruin That, their Submission cannot be a Virtue.*

Thus we see how admirably Mr. H. observes the Apostle's Exhortation, † *to be a follower of him, as he also was of Christ*; how faithfully he recommends the same Doctrine to his Admirers, that St. Paul taught the Romans; and how likely they are to approve themselves good Christians, by forsaking the Apostle, to follow him; there being nothing more plain, than that the one as positively enjoins a Passive, Submissive Non-resistance, even to tyrannical oppressive Princes, to a *Claudius*, or a *Nero*; as the other decries and condemns it, and would confine our Obedience, || *only to such Governors as answer the good End of their Institution*, by making it their continual Study to promote the publick Welfare.

Which gives just Cause to wonder how this Book has been suffer'd to go on triumphantly so long together, for want of an Answer; and the Author and his Partizans so highly to value themselves upon it, as if it were unanswerable. Whereas, from what is already said, it is obvious to observe how easie a thing it must be to answer it; in as much as if the Varnish and Flourishes be but once taken off from it, it plainly appears to be only the old Doctrine of the Covenanters and Regicides in King Charles the Martyr's

Days, new vampt, and set forth in a more modish Dress.

This therefore is the Province I have undertaken : And in the Discharge of it, I hope to make it evident beyond Contradiction, that this Doctrine of forcibly resisting our Lawful Sovereign, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the Writings of the primitive Christians, to the Doctrines of our own Church, and the express Declarations of Multitudes of its most eminent Divines, ever since the Reformation, Archbishops, Bishops, and others, to our Law-Books and Statutes ; and in short, to the Laws both of God and the Land. And that I may proceed herein the more regularly, and to the better Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall divide what I have to offer into these two Parts.

I. To shew that Mr. *H.* has not proved the Truth of his Doctrine of Resistance.

II. To evince on the other hand, the Groundlessness and Falsity of it.

PART

P A R T I.

FIRST I am to shew that Mr. *Hoadly* has not proved the *Doctrine of Resistance*. He tells us, *what * St. Paul has deliver'd in this Chapter, † concerning the Duty of Subjects, is not barely by way of Precept, or Command, only, as he hath done in many other Cases; but by way of reasoning, or enforcing one thing from another, which will help mightily to secure the true Sense of the Place. So that in order to prove that I have mistaken, or misrepresented St. Paul, it will not be sufficient to say that he condemns Resistance, and presseth Subjection, (for SO, says he, DO I LIKEWISE:)* but it must be shewn that his Reasoning concludes against the Resistance, *WHICH I HAVE TAUGHT TO BE LAWFUL*; and necessarily infers such a Passive Submission, as I have denied to follow from it; and that this Passage is of that peculiar Nature, that it can admit of no Restrictions, tho' numberless other Passages of the New Testament necessarily require them.

Here Mr. *H.* assures us, that he himself condemns Resistance, and presses Subjection, as St. Paul does. Tho' if he had set himself to preach directly against his own Text, he could not well have preached otherwise than he has done. St. Paul is as express as may be against Resistance: But Mr. *Hoadly*, that he may contradict himself, as well as his Text, tells us in the same Breath, that he has taught Resistance to be lawful. An excellent Method certainly, of condemning Resistance, and pressing Subjection, by teaching that 'tis lawful to

* P. 63. 64. † Rom. 13.

Resist. This is Mr. *H.*'s manner of Doctrine ; but he will never be able to perswade the World it is St. *Paul*'s.

On the contrary, St. *Paul*, as he justly observes, not only delivers himself in the Words under Consideration, *by way of Precept or Command*, but by way of Reasoning, or inferring one thing from another : He not only requires every Soul to be subject to the Higher Powers, but enforces this Command from the Original of Authority, in that *there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be are ordained of God* ; by denouncing eternal Vengeance to such as Resist, assuring them that they shall receive to themselves Damnation ; and again, by representing the Usefulness of Government, the Benefits whereof are yet a farther Obligation to ready Submission to Governors, inasmuch as *Rulers are not a terror to good Works, but to the evil*. Thus powerfully does the Apostle press this Duty of Obedience and Submission upon all Subjects, which one would have thought should have been Warning enough to Mr. *H.* not to teach the *Lamfulness of Resistance*.

And this Consideration is moreover a sufficient Argument to prove that *these Words will admit of no Restriction*, tho' numberless others may, namely because the Apostle's Reasoning is directly against it, and there is nothing in any other Part of Scripture to restrain them, as there is for abundance of other general Expressions.

Thus much in general concerning Mr. *H.*'s Method of handling these Words, and the Inconsistency of his Doctrine with the Apostles. But it will be requisite, in order to a fuller Detection of his Errors, to follow him thro' the several extravagant Propositions, he undertakes to maintain in his own Vindication : Which, to avoid mistake, I shall first lay down in his own Words, and then shall proceed to an impartial Consideration of them. They are these Five :

I. *The Apostle meant this* [the Subjection due to the higher Powers] † of all Sorts of supream Powers; and that there is no Power but of God, certainly extends equally to all who are possess'd of any sort of Power, to be exercis'd for the Good of the Publick.

II. * *That Governor who is not a terror to Evil Works, but to Good; who is not the Minister of Good to the Virtuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only; and who is not continually watching for the Good and Happiness of Humane Society, is not the Governor whom St. Paul meant in this Place, or to whom he here presses Obedience.*

III. † *These Higher Powers are from God, as they act agreeably to his Will, which is, that they should promote the Happiness and Good of Humane Society, which St. Paul all along supposes them to do. And consequently when they do the contrary, they cannot be said to be from God, or to act by his Authority, any more than an Inferiour Magistrate may be said to act by a Prince's Authority, whilst he acts directly contrary to his Will.*

IV. ‡ *Though the Authority of a Prince, in carrying forward the end of his Power, cannot be resisted without the Highest Guilt; yet his Power in acting contrary to that end, may be opposed without the shadow of a Crime; nay, with Honour and Glory. This he tells us afterwards, * is the Principal Doctrine contain'd in his Sermon, and it plainly appears to be what he chiefly aimed at Establishing, That supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the end of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Public, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governours.*

V. And lastly, || *The Public Peace and Happiness of Mankind is the Sole end of Government, as well if it be appointed by God himself, as if it be purely of Humane Institution; and again in other Terms,*

† P. 18. * P. 21. † P. 24. ‡ P. 31. * P. 40. || P. 32.

* *Submission is due to Governors, not for their own sake, but meerly for the sake of the Public Happiness.*

These Principles Mr. H. lays down, and though he owns them † *to have given offence*, (as they very justly might) he however undertakes the Defence of them. And to let the Reader see how successfully he has performed this undertaking, I now apply my self to enquire into the Truth of them. Which having done, I shall proceed to what else falls under this First Part of my Task.

C H A P. I.

Whether bare Possession of the Throne gives a Right to the Subject's Allegiance?

THE first Position here laid down is, *That the Subjection which St. Paul requires to be paid to the Higher Powers, he requires to be paid to all sorts of them*; and that these Words, *There is no Power but of God*, extend equally to all who are got into a Throne. For so his words are, as I cited them before; ‡ *The Apostle meant this* [the Subjection due to the Higher Powers] *of all sorts of Supreme Powers*; and that there is no Power but of God, certainly extends equally to all who are possess'd of any sort of Power, to be exercis'd for the good of the Public. This says Mr. H. is certain. And yet it is much more certain, that this Notion has been abundantly confuted, || in Divers Treatises during the long Rebellion: And since that, in * two very Judicious and Learned Discourses, written purposely upon this very Subject; not to mention

* *Ibid.* † P. 33. ‡ P. 8. || *Sanderfonus de Obligatione Consuetudinaria; præcipue vero prælect.* 5. n. 12, & 15. *Plea for the Nonsubscribers*, Printed in the year 1650. *The Exercitation concerning Usurped Powers*, Printed in the same year. * *Case of Allegiance to a King in Possession, with the Vindication.* seve-

several other † excellent Tracts to the same purpose. So that Mr. H. ought in all Reason, to have tried first how he could Answer these, before he took upon him to flourish with this Doctrine, as if it had never been put to Silence.

Some acts of Obedience may be perform'd under an Usurper, such as the Defence of one's Country against the Invasion of Foreign Enemies, the Promotion of Trade, and the Administration of Justice betwixt Man and Man. And some Learned Men have thought, the Punishment of Malefactors, (though I know others of great Note, have question'd the Lawfulness of Executing Criminals under an Usurpation. And * it is observ'd of Sir *Matthew Hale* in particular, that when a Judge under *Cromwell*, he yet refus'd to sit on the Crown-side to Try those Accus'd of Felony or Treason, as not reckoning any Commission but the King's sufficient to bear him out in so doing.) These, and such as these, the Safety and Welfare of the Society whereto we belong requires of its Members, though it should happen to be under a King who were so only in Fact. As has been observ'd by the Excellent Bishop *Sander-son* in his admirable Discourse, † *de Obligatione Conscientiæ*. And a Man may so far consult his Country's Good, and lend his Assistance for promoting it with a safe Conscience. But ‡ the Case is very different when an Intruder claims all the Duty and Allegiance that belongs, and ought therefore to be paid

‡ *Kettlewell's Duty of Allegiance settled upon its true Grounds. The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examined. Answer to a late Pamphlet Intituled Obedience and Submission, &c. And an Answer to the Vindication of it. An Examination of the Arguments, drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, and its Vindication.. Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Consider'd.*

* *Bishop Burnet's Life of Sir Matthew Hale, p. 24.*

† *Prælect. 5. n. 19.* ‡ *Proinde Regni Invasori sic præstandum est obsequium, ut fidelitas legitimo Principi debita nullatenus violetur, nec quidquam fiat in juris sui præjudicium. R. Sander-sonus de Obligat. Conscientiæ, Præl. 5. n. 20.*

only

only to a Rightful Sovereign. And yet it is no less than this that Mr. *H.* would have laid in common, as due to every one that has Power enough to demand it, provided they do not employ their Power to the Ruine of those over whom they have set themselves. Wherefore of this Principle of his I desire ~~me~~ it may be observ'd, that,

1. It is Unreasonable, and would be a great Encouragement to attempts upon the Sovereignty, to the great Disturbance and Damage of the Subjects, as well as of the Sovereign. It would make the State of Princes very Precarious and Uncertain, when it was once generally believed, that if any one of Interest and Design could but contrive to displace them ~~and~~ and get into their Room, he were in no wise to be accountable for his ill Usage of them, but the whole People were bound to assist him against them. And by occasioning frequent Insurrections it must be highly prejudicial also to the Subjects, a great part of whom are usually great sufferers upon a Revolution, and so much the greater, by how much the longer it is in bringing about.

And, though when the Invader is once settled, it may prove of use to those who are ready enough in turning upon every change of Government, it has not been thought for their Reputation, nor any Commendation of their Honesty, thus to behave themselves upon every Change. This, says a great Man, * *is a fine plyable Principle as a Man could wish, 'twill lap about your Finger like Barbary-Gold. Thus when King Charles the First of Blessed Memory, had that Power in his Hands, this was an extraordinary Providence, and the Right of Government was in Him. But stay, it may be the Doctor had not studied the point himself so soon. But to be sure when the Parliament got the better, that was an extraordinary*

* Bp. Grove's *Vindication of the Conforming Clergy*, in *Answer to Mr. Jenkins*, p. 16.

Providence indzed, and then, without doubt, they were the Supreme Authority, as their Petitioner Stiles them; and so was Oliver Cromwell, and so was Richard, and so was the Rump, and so was the Committee of Safety, and so was I know not who, and so round, untill his Majesty's most Happy Restoration; and then because there was an extraordinary Providence in that, so is He too; and so Mr. Jenkyn is as good a Subject as can be desired, and so he had been whoever had come. And so would Mr. Hoadly if he had liv'd in those times; and according to his Principles must have condemned all those Brave Men as Traytors and Rebels, who were so little instructed in his Divinity as to lose all they had, and many of them their Dearest Lives, for the sake of their Lawful Sovereign. Such versatile Subjects as these are but a broken Staff, or Reed, like Egypt, on which, says the Prophet, * if a Man lean, it will go into his hand and pierce it. Their Prince can Repose no manner of Trust in them; he is sure they will Deceive him, whensoever they find his Case to be such, that they can expect to do it to Advantage, that is to say, when he has most need of their Assistance.

2. Such a transferring our Allegiance is highly unjust towards our Natural Sovereign, to whom alone it of Right belongs. It is no less than a Robbing him of a due, that both † our Saviour, and his ‡ Apostle St. Paul require to be rendered him by all his Subjects. And it is making our selves Parties to the Usurpation, by giving up our Allegiance to the Usurper, and thereby engaging to assist him in his Unjust Possession. And so should we become Guilty, if not of a Forcible Entry, yet of an Unjust Detaining what is another's Right; and seeing Justice is owing at least as much to Sovereign Princes as to lesser Persons, our Guilt in this Case, must be of a very heinous Nature, especially if we had been such as besides our Natural Allegiance, had sworn Fidelity to

* Isa. 36. 6. † St. Matt. 22. 21. ‡ Rom. 13. 7.

them and their Heirs, and Lawful Successors, and so cannot dispose of our Allegiance from them, without breach of Oath, added to our other Injustice towards them.

Besides, there is no Person so Great, or in so High a Station, as not to be oblig'd by the Common Laws of God, and the Law of Nature, no less than the Meanest Subject, and so all are necessarily tied to make Restitution of whatsoever is unjustly withheld from its true Proprietor. And to say that Allegiance is due to those who are thus bound, as they either fear God, or love their own Souls, to Surrender the Power they have no Right to; to say that Allegiance is due to them, and * by consequence that they are to be assisted by all means in our Power, even with the hazard, it may be the loss of our Lives, is to say, that the whole Nation are oblig'd to involve themselves in the same Crime, and so to partake both of their Guilt here, and their Punishment hereafter. And whether the utmost Temporal Advantage can compensate for this, our Blessed Saviour has determined beyond Contradiction or Dispute; *St. Matthew* 16. 26. *What shall it profit a Man, if he shall gain the whole World, and lose his own Soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his Soul?*

So that upon both these accounts, it is manifestly against the Rules of Justice, to suppose that bare Possession, without Right, should give a Title to the Subjects Allegiance. And it is therefore in no wise to be imagin'd that *St. Paul* would require the Subjects Obedience to be paid to the Invaders of Power and Government, as *Mr. H.* teaches it ought to be. No, the Apostle understood his Office better, than

* *Ligantia* est ex qua Domino tenentur Vassalli sui contra omnes homines qui mori possunt & vivere, proprii corporis præbere consilii & auxilii juvamentum, — nec ei adversantium partem in aliquo confovere. *Cowel's Interpretation in the Word Ligancie.* And so says the Lord Ch. *J. Coke*; *Ligancie* is, true, and Faithful Obedience of the Subject due to the Sovereign. *Reports*, 1. 7. p. 4.

to Preach up Injustice, and direct his Readers to pay their Allegiance where it was not due. He order'd it to be paid to such Governors as were *ordin'd of God*, not to any that could Dethrone them, and get into their Place, tho' by ever so Unreasonable and Wicked Means.

He knew very well that an Unjust Action could never create a Right where there was none before. It may in some Cases help to it, may make that a certain and present Right, which was but future and contingent, by removing the Impediments that were in the way to it. As when an Invader, who had a remote Title to a Throne, violently thrusts himself into it before his time, by the Slaughter of all that stood between Him and It. Which had been the Case of *Richard III.*, had his Niece by his Means, undergone the same Fate with her Two Brothers. But this method of proceeding can never create a new Right, where there is no other ground for it.

If it could, this would make it utterly unlawful for an oppressed Prince to endeavour the Recovery of his lost Crown, tho' his Title to it were ever so clear. And so it would condemn * *David's* attempt to regain his Kingdom from *his undutiful Son Absalom*, after he had been Two years King *de Facto*, and † *Jehoiada's* dethroning *Athaliah*, in order to the Restauration of his Lawful Sovereign *Joash*, whose Authority she had Traiterously and Wickedly taken upon her to Execute. And which it concerns Mr *H.* more particularly to consider; after all his professions of Loyalty and Zeal for Queen *ANN*, if Her Majesty should ever come to be any way Dispossess'd of the Throne of *Great Britain*, and another though ever so wrongfully got into it, it would, according to his Doctrine, be Unlawful and Damnable to make the least Step towards Her Recovery of it; and all those must needs be Rebels, that should dare to side with Her Majesty claiming against the Intruder in Pos-

* 2 Sam. 15, &c. † 2 Kings 11. 12.

session. Such an Excellent Subject is Mr. *H.* and such are all those sure to be that follow his Doctrine in this Point.

And here it deserves further to be considered, that tho' the Sovereign be, under God, * the Fountain of all Power, and all the Laws when tendered by the Two Houses, are enacted by him or her, and are afterwards executed by the same Authority; yet this Doctrine of Mr. *H.* leaves the Sovereign, whether King, or Queen, in a far worse condition in this respect than any of the Subjects. For no Subject loses his Inheritance by another's wresting it out of his Hands, so long as he is able to prove his Right to it; but so soon as ever he has made out his Claim, the Laws order, and it is accordingly the Magistrate's business to provide that he be restor'd to it, with all its Privileges and Emoluments, together with Costs of Suit for the Charges he has been at in the Recovery of it. But if the King or Queen lose the Crown, there is no help in this Case, all the Subjects are immediately bound to turn Enemies, and venture their Lives and all they have to keep out their *Rightful* Sovereign, tho' ever so well convinced of the Justice of the Claim. As if Justice were owing to all the rest of the Nation, but none at all to the Prince. He that talks at this rate, must either have found out a New Gospel, or very grossly Misinterpreted the Old.

A Cheater, or a Housebreaker, a Highway-man by Land, or a Pirate by Sea, may make himself Possessor of my Goods; but he can never have a Right and Title to them. His Unjust Possession, conveys no Just Claim to them; but I am still at Liberty to use all

* Multum tamen falluntur qui existimant, cum reges acta quædam sua nolunt rata esse, nisi à Senatu, aut alio cætu aliquo probentur, partitionem fieri potestatis. *Grot. de Juri. Bel. ac P.* l. 1. c. 3. Sect. 18. Hanc Legislationem quæ alii quam summæ potestati competit, nihil imminuere de jure summæ potestatis. *Id. de imp. sum. pot. circa Sacra*, c. 8. p.

Lawful means for their Recovery. I may Sue him at Law if I can come at him, or may Prosecute him as a Malefactor, and he be made to refund what he has either by Fraud or Force got Wickedly into his Power. Or if either through my want of sufficient Witnesses, or his suborning False ones, by the Corruption of the Judge, or the Partiality and Perjury of the Jury, he should escape with his Ill-gotten Prey, he is still as much oblig'd, in the Sight of God as ever, to make me Satisfaction for the Injury I have received by him. So long as he deprives me of what I have the sole Propriety in, so long he continues a Transgressor and an Usurper in God's account, and can hope for no forgiveness at His Hands, without a previous Repentance and Restitution. According to that known Saying of * *St. Augustin, Non remittetur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum.* There is no Remission of the Sin to be hoped for, without Restitution first made.

And is not the Law the same for Princes, as for private Persons? Are they not both alike God's Creatures, and his Subjects? And must not both hope to be saved upon the same Terms of the Gospel? Is not the Eighth Commandment prescribed as a Rule to all, both high and low, honourable and ignoble, Prince and Peasant, to him that sitteth upon the Throne, and to him that grindeth at the Mill? And are not all equally obliged to the faithful and conscientious Observance of it? How then comes Mr. *H.* to ascribe the same Authority to the unjust as to the rightful Possessor of a Crown? I am sure he finds nothing in Scripture to countenance such a wild Notion, but a great deal against it; as I shall shew presently. But before I come to that, I must observe,

3. That this Doctrine of his is totally subversive of our *English* Constitution. For there is nothing more generally acknowledged by all, than that the Constitution of our Monarchy is Hereditary. So says the

Lord Chief Justice * *Coke*, the † Lord Chancellor *Ellesmere*, || Judge *Jenkins*. Whence the Author of the *Present State of England*, affirms it as a known Truth, that ‡ *upon the Death of the King, the next of Kindred, though born out of the Dominions of England, or born of Parents not Subjects of England, as by the Law, and many Examples in the English History, it doth manifestly appear, is, and is immediately King, before any Proclamation, Coronation, Publication, or Consent of Peers, or People.* To this Purpose also, speak our Histories, and our Statutes. For, from hence it was that * King *Stephen* having usurped the Throne, was forced to a Compromise with the Empress *Maud*, whose Right it was, and her Son *Henry*, afterwards *Henry II.* As also in the Statute of Trea-

* *The Kings of England, who are Monarchs and absolute Princes, hold their Kingdoms and Dominions, by lawful Succession, and by inherent Birthright, and Descent of Inheritance, according to the Fundamental Laws of this Realm.* Rep. 5. p. 39. *The King holdeth the Kingdom by Birthright inherent, by Descent from the Blood Royal, whereupon Succession doth attend.* Rep. 7. p. 18.

† *Among undoubted Maxims and Principles of our Law, these are mentioned: In Cases of the Crown, The Female to inherit: The eldest sole to be preferred: No Respect of Half-Blood: No Tenant in Dower, or by the Curtesy of the Crown: No Disability of the King's Person, by Infancy, &c.* *Speech touching the Postnati.* p. 36. *All which Expressions plainly suppose the Crown hereditary.*

|| *That the King is not a Person trusted with a Power, but that it is his Inherent Birthright from God, Nature, and the Law.* *Jenkins rediviv.* p. 23. *We maintain that the King is King by an inherent Birthright, by Nature, by God's Law, and by the Law of the Land.* p. 38. *All our Books of Law say they have the Crown by Descent, and the Statutes of the Land declare that they have the same by inherent Birthright.* p. 58.

‡ *Part I. Ch. 5.*

* *Collier's Eccl. Hist. of Great Britain.* l. 4. p. 341. *Polyd. Verg. Angl. Hist.* l. 12. p. 204, 205.

sons, * it is declared High-Treason *to compass or imagine the Death*, not only of the King or Queen, but of the King's eldest Son, who is there also expressly stiled *HIS HEIR*. Hence likewise † Richard Duke of York's Title was owned by the House of Lords, and they declared that *it could not be defeated*; the ‖ Three *Henries* are so often stiled *Pretensed Kings*, and *Kings in Deed, but not in Right*; and ‡ Richard III. stands attainted by the Name of *Richard Duke of Gloucester*, namely, by reason of his not having Right to the Crown, whilst his Niece *Elizabeth*, afterwards Queen to King *Henry VIIth.* was before him. And hence again, * the *Lady Jane Gray*, was forced to lay down the Title of *QUEEN*, and the next Year was put to Death for having assumed it. But the fullest Proof of all, and than which a fuller cannot be desired, is that of the Parliament of King † *James I.*

* 25 Ed. III. ch. 2. † Rot. Parl. 39 Hen. 6. n. 18. Brady's true and exact Hist. of the Succession of the Crown, p. 386. ‖ 1 Edw. 4. c. 1. ‡ 1 Hen. 7. c. 6. * Bishop of Sarum's Hist. of the Reformation, Vol. 2. p. 272.

† We therefore, your most humble and loyal Subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, do from the Bottom of our Hearts yield to the Divine Majesty all humble Thanks and Praises, not only for the said unspeakable and inestimable Benefits and Blessings, abovementioned, but also that he hath farther enriched your Highness with a most Royal Progeny of most rare and excellent Gifts and Forwardness, and in his Goodness is likely to increase the happy Number of them: And in most humble and lowly Manner do beseech your most excellent Majesty, that as a Memorial to all Posterities, amongst the Records of your high Court of Parliament for ever to endure, of our Loyalty, Obedience, and hearty and humble Affection, it may be published and declared in this high Court of Parliament, and Enacted by Authority of the same, that we (being bounden thereunto, both by the Laws of God and Man) do recognize and acknowledge (and thereby express our unspeakable Joys) that immediately upon the Dissolution and Decease of *Elizabeth*, late Queen of England, the Imperial Crown of the Realm of England, and of all the Kingdoms, Dominions, and Rights belonging to the

same, did by inherent Birthright, and lawful and undoubted Succession, descend and come to your most excellent Majesty, as being lineally, justly, and lawfully, next and sole Heir of the Blood Royal of this Realm, as is aforesaid; and that by the Goodness of God Almighty, and lawful Right of Descent, under one Imperial Crown, your Majesty is of the Realms and Kingdoms of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, the most potent and mighty King, and by God's Goodness, more able to protect and govern us your loving Subjects, in all Peace and Plenty, than any of your noble Progenitors: And thereunto we most humbly and faithfully do submit and oblige our selves, our Heirs and Posterities for ever, until the last Drop of our Blood be spent: And we do beseech your Majesty to accept the same, as the First fruits in this High Court of Parliament, of our Loyalty and Faith to your Majesty, and to your Royal Progeny and Posterity for ever: Which if your Majesty shall be pleased (as an Argument of your gracious Acceptation) to adorn with your Majesty's Royal Assent, without which it can neither be compleat and perfect, nor remain to all Posterity, according to our most humble Desire, (as a Memorial of your Princely tender Affection towards us) we shall add this also to the rest of your Majesty's unspeakable and inestimable Benefits,
1 Jac. cap. 1. n. 4.

declaring and enacting the Crown of this Realm, and all the Dominions and Rights belonging to it, to have by inherent Birthright, and lawful and undoubted Succession descended to him, upon the Death of Queen Elizabeth, as next Heir of the Royal Line, and thereby obliging themselves and their Posterity, even to the last Drop of their Bloods, to His Majesty and his Royal Progeny and Posterity for ever. *

So that it is not possible to express this Matter more fully than they have done. And yet according to Mr. H's Doctrine all this is blown off at once; and could but a Simnel or a Warbeck get into the Throne by whatsoever Means, he presently commences a rightful Sovereign; and the Allegiance becomes

* See also 1 Mar. Sess. 2. cap. 1. & 1 Eliz. cap. 3. and the Form of proclaiming King Charles II. in Lord Chand. Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion. Part 3. p. 395.

Immediately as due to him, as to the most regular hereditary Monarch that ever was. Nor can I see what can be said, why the Lady *Jane Gray*, or *Oliver*, or *Richard Cromwel*, was not according to Mr. *H*'s. way of Reasoning, necessarily to have been obey'd and defended; and Queen *Mary*, and King *Charles II*: to have been opposed as Invaders of their Neighbour's Dominions.

In a Word, here you have the Inheritance of the whole Royal Family defeated; and all the Statutes that declare this to be an Hereditary Monarchy, made no better than wast Paper.

Which is such a Confusion of right and wrong, just and unjust, as totally discards the Eighth Commandment, no less than the Fifth, together with the Apostle's Exhortation, *Render therefore to all their dues*, and leaves all the Royal Family in a worse Condition than other Men, the Crown which is the greatest of Temptations, by this means becoming *præda raptoris*, the Reward of every successful Rebel's Violence and Treason. Nor can there be according to Mr. *H*. such a Sin as Usurpation, unless where the Usurper has the Misfortune to be stopped in his Career, before he can get the Crown thoroughly into his Possession; or else makes an ill use of it when he has it, to the Ruin of the Community. So that where-soever this Principle prevails, he who attempts to dethrone his Prince, and set up himself in his Stead, is a Traitor, and a Villain, if he miscarry in his Attempt; but a rightful King, and a lawful Governor, if he prove so successful, as to accomplish his wicked and execrable Undertaking. Which, as I have before shewn to be highly unreasonable and unjust, so is it by no means reconcilable to the *English* Constitution, according to which our Kings are to Reign by Hereditary Descent.

4. This Notion is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, which forbid to do Injustice to any, and not less to Kings than others; and condemn the advancing of Princes by indirect and unlawful means. As is plain

from that Reprehension given the *Israelites*, by the Prophet *Hosea*, * *They have set up Kings, but not by me; they have made Princes, and I knew it not*, that is, so as to approve or allow of it. So Reason would teach to expound the Expression, since it is not possible for God, to whom all things are naked and open, to have been ignorant of it. And so do other Places of Scripture, where the same Word, and *γινώσκω*, that answers to it in the Greek, are used in this Sense. Particularly *Psal.* 1. 6. *The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish.* And *St. Matt.* 7. 23. *Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you, depart from me ye that work Iniquity.* In both which Places it is manifest from the Antithesis, that to be known of God, must necessarily import to be known with Approbation †. And agreeably to this use of the Word speaks also the Apostle *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 3. *If any Man love God, the same is known of him.* As the contrary Phrase is used likewise, *Isa.* 43. 25. *I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins*, that is, not so as to punish the Offenders for them. And now if Kings in Possession of others Thrones are set up without God, as himself declares, if he do not own and approve them when thus set up, it is very hard to comprehend, how these should be his Ordinance, or have any Authority derived to them by him. Those who Reign by a just legal Title he owns for his Ministers, professing of them, that they reign by him; but these others he discards as their own, or the People's Kings, but none of his: *Coming not in at the Door, but climbing up another Way*, they are no more God's Ordinance in the State, than such as enter after the same manner would be in the Church. And we all know what Character our blessed Lord ‡ gives of such.

Thus it appears how extravagant this first Position is, as being contrary to Reason, to Justice, to the

* *לֹא יָדַעְתִּי* Hof. 8. 4. † See also *Psal.* 101. 4. and *Rom.* 7. 15. ‡ *Prov.* 8. 15. † *John* 10. 1.

Constitution of our Government, and to the Holy Scriptures themselves; and that it is therefore what Mr. H. has no great Reason to be proud of.

However he thinks, * *that Subjection to Princes in Possession, was the Practice and Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, without obliging themselves or their Followers, to examine nicely into the Title of Princes, and the Legality of their Accession to the Throne.* And is this enough that Mr. H. thinks so? Ought he not to have proved it rather? Or does he imagine, that every body must be just of his Mind, whether he shew any Reason for it, or not? This is more than he can reasonably expect.

Therefore he † *thinks* again, that this would be a Task too hard for all Subjects, who are equally concerned. But what if he thinks all Subjects cannot distinguish nicely betwixt the Titles of Princes, does he therefore think that none of all their Subjects can? May not some be of a more penetrating Judgment, and have had more Experience of the World, and of the State of the Government they live under, than divers of their Neighbours? And must not these examine where their Allegiance is due, only because those others either will not set about it, or cannot hope to do it with Success? Is their Neighbours Ignorance to be the Standard of these Mens Knowledge, or Their Indifferency the Rule of these Mens Duty? So long as they have immortal Souls to save, it nearly concerns them to beware what Promises they make, what Engagements they enter into, what Oaths they take, what Duty they profess, what Submission they oblige themselves to, and to whom; lest otherwise they inconsiderately bring upon themselves a severe Destruction. If a Fellow-Subject to whom I am indebted, dies, it is reasonable to suppose I will be satisfied who is his true Executor or Administrator, before I venture to pay my Debt, lest I make a wrong Payment to the Prejudice of the rightful Claimant, and be liable to be called again to account for

* Page 19. † Ibid.

it, and perhaps be made to pay it a second Time. And ought not every Christian to be much more concerned for his Soul, than for his Money? Or does not that Apostolical Injunction, to *render every one his due*, oblige as much in relation to the Prince, with a particular Respect to whom it was given, as to our Fellow-Subjects; and this whether he be in a prosperous State, or unjustly oppress'd and thrust out of his Throne; as it is, well known too many have been in all Ages? For Subjects to withdraw their Allegiance at any time from an injur'd Sovereign, and give it to a Stranger, only because the former is already too highly injur'd, is but to add *affliction to his bonds*; to heap one Grievance upon another; and to try to press him lower, for no other Reason, but because he is already down too low. Which would be thought an insupportable Method of Procedure towards all the World besides; and not very likely therefore to be taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, towards Princes, for whom they have shewn so peculiar a Regard.

Again, are there not Cases, where the Titles of Princes have no Intricacy in them, but are plain and obvious to every one's Understanding? And is no Regard to be had to these? It is too much to infer, that a Subject must not be true to his Sovereign, whom he certainly knows to be so, only because there have been some other Pretenders to a Crown, of whom it was not easie to determine, whether they had a Right to it, or not. In this, as in all other Instances of his Duty, a Man must see that he act sincerely, as in the Sight of God, and must be sure to pay his Allegiance to Him, or Her, whom he knows to be his rightful Sovereign, whether in Possession or not. And this is no more than may be done without any *nice* Enquiry into the Intricacy of doubtful Titles. If the Case be so involved, that he cannot hope to make a right Judgment concerning it, it is but reasonable to submit to the Possessor, not upon Account of any Right accruing to him by bare Possession, but be-
cause

cause no other Person appears to have a just Claim to his Allegiance, or to be wronged by his paying it in this Manner. But when another evidently appears to have the Right, he that would keep a clear Conscience, and shew himself a good Subject, and a good Christian, must persist in his Fidelity to such his rightful Sovereign, whatever may be the Consequences as to this Life; not suffering any present Hopes of Advantage, or Fear of Losses, either in Body, Goods, or Name, to carry him over to the Side of the injurious Possessor. Nor does our blessed Saviour, or any one of his Apostles, ever teach the contrary, tho' Mr. H. does.

Mr. H. says, * *what is called by some Usurpation, is not always evil*; by which he means either real Usurpation, or not. If not, it is nothing to the purpose; for the Subjects Allegiance depends not upon what Princes are called by some, but what they are. If he means real Usurpation, it is incumbent upon him to prove, That this is not always Evil. Injustice is always Evil; and Usurpation, being a Species of it, cannot be Good.

Oh! but in Mr. H's. Judgment; † *It is as easie to believe that God may be the Patron of Usurpation, so far as to require Subjection to all Princes in Possession, acting for the Good of the Public, as to believe, that God can be the Patron of the greatest Tyranny and Oppression; so far as to make it a necessary Duty, passively to submit to the Will of Tyrants and Oppressors.* As much as to say, It no more reflects upon the Infinite Holiness and Purity of the Divine Nature, to encourage an Unreasonable Ambition, and the Highest Injustice, than it does to call Men to Suffer under the Violence of Wicked and Inhuman Governors, in order to his Glory, and their own incomparable Felicity in another World. And will Mr. H. stand to this so great an Absurdity? I am pretty confident, that upon second thoughts he will not.

* Ibid. † Ibid.

Suffering wrongfully, though from the worst of Governors, is no Sin. Nay, if we suffer wrongfully, and *take it patiently*, * *this is acceptable with God*, and shall not lose its Reward. But the like can in no wise be said of Usurping another's Right, which is in its own Nature a Heinous Crime, and will accordingly meet with a very different recompence at the Day of Judgment. There is no Comparison betwixt Sin and Suffering; † The one is what God doth not Delight in, but the other he utterly Abominates, as being a perfect contradiction to his Pure and Holy Nature, and what he can never allow of in any. For this it was the fallen Angels were cast out of Heaven, and deliver'd over to Everlasting Burnings in the Bottomless Pit. For this our First Parents were thrust out of *Paradise*, and a Curse entail'd upon their Posterity ever since, and even to the end of the World. And there is no such Favourite of Heaven, as will not certainly be excluded thence, upon his allowance of himself in it. But outward Miseries and Calamities, of whatever sort, are only a Temporal and Transitory Misfortune, and may by a good improvement entitle us to a greater interest in the Divine Affections, and work out for us a much greater Reward, than we should otherwise have attained to, So says St. Paul, 2 Cor. 4. 17. *Our light Affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory*. Whence it necessary follows, that it can be no derogation from any of the Divine Attributes, to expose Persons to sufferings in this World, and to enjoyn them submissively to undergo the same, without taking upon them to be their own Avengers or Deliverers, and to reward them for it * superabundantly in another State. But it will never follow from hence, that it is as Mr. H. professes, as well to be believed, *that God can be the Patron of Usurpation*, that is, of Great Injustice, or

* 1 St. Pet. 2. 20. † Lam. 3. 33. * καὶ ὑπερβολῶς εἰς ὑπερβολῶν. 2 Cor. 4. 17.

will expect our Concurrence with, or Assistance of it against any whose Right is thus Unrighteously detain'd from them.

Mr. *H.* argues farther for Transferring our Allegiance to an Unjust Possessor; † Had St Paul intended to speak only of *such Rulers as have a Legal Right*, had this been his Intention, he would rather have told them by Inspiration, how they should judge of the Right of Princes, than have said nothing, but what must, upon this supposition, have set Christians upon nice inquiries, into the Right by which the present Possessor Reigned. I have considered his nice Inquiries already; and shall only ask here, Whether another might not plead with at least as much shew of Argument? That had the Apostle allow'd of Subjects transferring their Allegiance from their Lawful Governors in any case, he would have instanced in particulars, and not left Subjects to nice enquiries, whereby to inform themselves, to whom, and why, and when, and in what manner, and for what time they might transfer it. But the Truth is, the Apostle designed only to give a short intimation of the Duty of Christians towards the Governors under whom they did, or should afterwards, Live: And he has done it so, as to leave no reasonable ground of doubting, what his meaning was, as shall be shewn in its proper Place. At present I content my self to have only taken notice of Mr. *H.*'s Inference in this place, which from the very little I have said concerning it, appears much properer for a Popular Harangue, than for a serious and more deliberate Vindication; because having nothing of Argument in it.

And for this I have a very remarkable, as well as a very fresh Authority in the Lord Bishop of *Sarum*'s Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral there, the 5th of this instant *November*. In which, p. 10. I find these words, *The Higher Powers that may not lawfully be Resisted, are only the Legal, and not the Usurping Powers.*

† P. 19, 20.

And a little after, *I will not enter into an Examination of the words of St. Paul: This is certain, that Higher Powers, which are ordain'd of God, are only the lawful Powers, not to be applied to Usurpers.* And I hope his Lordship will not be offended at my opposing his greater Authority to that of Mr. H. whom I leave to disprove it, if he can.

I shall touch upon only one Expression more under this Head, which is, *That It would be hard to say, what Legal Rights the first Emperors had, whom the best and wisest of the Romans took for Usurpers.* This Mr. H. is very sure of; and yet what Right was it these Emperours wanted? 'Tis true, *Julius Caesar* altered the Government, and made it Monarchical, as it was first Founded by *Romulus*. Which, I hope, Mr. H. will not say is less justifiable, than their former procedure in laying aside their Kings had been. But when this was done, what was afterwards wanting to render him a rightful Governor? Was he not created * perpetual Dictator? and Saluted Emperor? And were not his Successors Legally advanc'd to the same Dignity and Powers? *Augustus* † was not only nominated by him as his Heir and Successor, but was acknowledged by the Senate, and declar'd *Augustus* by Senate and People. *Tiberius* ‡ was Adopted by *Augustus*, and appointed his First Executor, and had been his Colleague in the Empire, and Partaker of the *Tribunitian* Power, and shewn to all the Armies; yet || he most obstinately declin'd the Title of Emperor or Father of his Country, refus'd the Government, as too great a Burthen for him, and fit for none but an *Augustus* to manage; declared, that by the share he had had in it, he experimentally knew the weight of it, and that it ought

* *Plut. in vit. C. Cæs. p. 734. Sueton. C. Ju. Cæs. c. 76. Xiphilin. in Jul. Cæs. & Liv. Epit. l. 116. † Xiph. p. 30. 32, 69. ‡ Suet. in vit. Augusti c. ult. Tiber. c. 15. Tacit. Annal. l. 1. p. 4. Vell. Paterc. l. 2. p. 64. || Suet. in vit. Tiber. c. 26. Xiph. p. 104. Tacit. Annal. l. 1. p. 35. Ut imperium iniret, & Patris Patriæ appellationem — obstinatissime recusasse. Suet. c. 67.*

not to be committed to any single Person ; and * would not undertake it but at the earnest and repeated entreaty of the Senate. *Caligula* did not shew himself so backward to accept of the Empire, yet † he had it committed to him by the Senate, to the wonderful satisfaction and joy of the People, who also expressed a very particular concern for his Safety and Welfare. *Claudius*, it is true, ‡ was first set up by the Soldiers, and very unexpectedly, when he had been hiding himself in the Palace ; but he was soon after acknowledged by the Consuls, was made Emperour, and had all the Honours decreed him, that had been given to his Predecessors. Upon his Death *Nero*, || tho' very Young, was immediately Proclaim'd Emperour, and carried in a Litter into the Army, and thence brought back, by the Soldiers, into the Court, and owned by the Senate. And now what farther was wanting to make these Lawful and Rightful Governours ? What flaw can Mr. *H.* find in any of their Titles ? They had been solemnly invested with the Imperial Dignity and Ensigns, had been approved of by the Senate, and owned by the People, and had no Claimant to plead a Right against them. So that all Mr. *H.* can possibly make of this instance, will not promote his Cause one tittle. For without doubt a free People may give up their Freedom, may submit, and pay what Allegiance, and to whom they please ; but then these Governours, thus own'd and submitted to, are not to be accounted Usurpers, nor to be Obeyed purely upon the account of their being in Possession ; but because of their being Rightfully so. And so they fall not under our present Consideration, nor can be esteem'd the Subject of this Debate, which is design'd only for such Princes as at any time are set up, in opposition to other rightful Sovereigns who are justly

* Tacit. *Annal.* l. i. p. 5, 12, 13. Vell. Pat. p. 75. Suet. c. 24. † Suet. *in vit.* Calig. c. 14. ‡ Xiph. & *Aurel. Vict.* || Sueton. *in vit.* Ner. c. 8. Tacit. *Annal.* l. 12.

entituled to the Power these are possess'd of. And of such only Mr. *H.* ought to have shewn, that the Subjects Allegiance is due to them ; and not to have insisted upon the *Roman* Emperors, who could have no lawful Competitors, themselves being at that time, the only Lawful Governors.

The Summ is, That God Almighty is a Patron of Right and Justice, and not of Injustice and Usurpation. Nor will he allow his Worshippers to transfer their Allegiance from their Natural and Rightful Sovereign, to whatsoever Intruder that shall at any time have got the Possession of the Throne, and shall have Might and Power, but no Legal Authority over them ; and that a Faithful Adherence to the Hereditary Constitution of our Government in particular, is not the less Reasonable and Honest, or the less agreeable to the Doctrine of the Gospel, because Mr. *H.* thinks it not necessary.

C H A P. II.

Whether a bad Governor cannot be that Minister to whom St. Paul requires Submission and Obedience ?

MR. H--'s Second Position is this; * *That Governor, who is not a terror to Evil Works, but to Good; who is not the Minister of Good to the Vertuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only, and who is not continually watching for the Good and Happiness of Humane Society, is not the Governor whom St. Paul means, and to whom he presses Obedience.* This Mr. H. thought he might safely say, because it is nothing but a Recapitulation of St. Paul's own words, without any Interpretation of them. But did he think Right? And is it really so, That St. Paul will not allow bad Governors to be the Ministers of God? Does the Apostle say, none are to be submitted to as such; but who truly answer the end of their Institution? This one would expect to find very clear, from what Mr. H. here Asserts; but if any consult St. Paul himself, he will find it to be quite otherwise: For St. Paul requires subjection to the Higher Powers, assuring us *there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be are ordain'd of God.* As if the Apostle should have said, Whosoever have their Commission from Almighty God, and so are made by him † the Higher Powers, (whether they act suitably to the trust repos'd in them, or not) are to have Subjection paid them; And for this Reason, because *there is no Power but of God*, none invested with Supream Authority, who has not received it from God. And if none have it but from God, then Wicked and Tyrannical Powers have theirs from him.

* P. 21. † Tropus hic est, ἐξουσία pro iis qui dignitatem habent, quo [tropo] non temere utitur, ut sciamus, Subjectionem ipsis dignitatibus habendam, etiamsi indigni sint qui sunt eo erecti. M. Pol. in loc.

This S. *Augustin* understood to be plainly the Apostle's meaning ; and therefore agreeably hereto, speaking of the *Roman Empire*, he tells us, * that *God bestows the Heavenly Felicity on the Godly only ; but the Kingdoms of the Earth, on both Godly and Ungodly, as it pleaseth him.* And a little after, † *He that gave the Kingdom to the Cruel Marius, gave it also to the most Gracious Cæsar ; He that gave it to Augustus, one of the best of Princes, gave it likewise to Nero one of the worst ; He that gave it to the Kind and Good Natur'd Vespasian, gave it no less to the Blood-Thirsty Domitian.* And again, he that gave it to *Constantine the Christian, gave it afterward to Julian the Apostate.* Whereto agrees that of *Theodoret*, * *When God is graciously inclined towards a People, he gives them Rulers, that have a Reverence for Justice ; — but when he designs to Punish a Disobedient Nation, he grants them to be, that is, he puts them, under the Power of evil Governors. For I will set over them, says God, Young Men to be their Princes, and Scoffers shall have Dominion over them.* And before either of these, it was *Irenæus's Doctrine*, that † *By whose Command Men are born, by his Command Kings*

* Quæ cum ita sint, non tribuamus dandi regni atq; imperii potestatem, nisi Deo vero, qui dat felicitatem, regnum cælorum solis piis : Regnum vero terrenum, & piis & impiis, sicut ei placet, cui nihil injuste placet. De civ. Dei. L. 5. C. 21.

† Qui Mario, ipse Caio Cæsari : qui Augusto, ipse & Neroni : Qui Vespasianis, vel Patri, vel Filio, suavissimis imperatoribus, ipse & Domitiano crudelissimo. Et ne per singulos ire necesse sit, qui Constantino Christiano, ipse Apostatae Juliano. *Ibid.*

* Εὐδοκίης μὲν τοι ὦν δίδωσι ἀρχόντας τιμῆς τὸ δίκαιον. δῶσα γὰρ αὐτοῖς, οἷσι ποιῶσαι καὶ τὴν καρδίαν μὲν, &c. παρὰ δ' εὖσαι δὲ πλημμελέσθαι βελόμενον καὶ παρὰ πονηρῶν ἀρχόντων ἀρχεῖν συγχωρεῖ. ἐπισήσω γὰρ, οἷσι, νεανίσκους ἀρχόντας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμπαινεῖται κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν. Theod. in Rom. 13. 1.

† Cujus enim jussu homines nascuntur, hujus jussu & Reges constituuntur, apti his qui illo tempore ab ipsis regantur. *Iren. adv. hæc. l. 5. c. 24.*

are

are Constituted, as suits best with the Circumstances of such as are to be Govern'd by them. For some of them are given for the amendment and benefit of their Subjects, and the Preservation of Justice; and others for Fear, and Punishment, and Reproof; and some again for Mocking, and Reproach, and Pride, according as they shall be found Worthy: the just Judgment of God disposing all things with the greatest Equity, as we have said.

Thus St. Paul's Doctrine was understood in the early Ages of the Church. And that there was, and is, very good Reason for understanding it so, whatsoever Mr. H. may apprehend to the contrary, will appear from other Places of Scripture, where Wicked Kings are sufficiently allowed to be from God. For to pass over the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, who were more immediately Commission'd by him, I shall begin with *Nebuchadnezzar*, whom I believe Mr. H. will not affirm to have been such a King as he describes St. Paul's Powers to be, one who was a true Patron to all that did well, and a Terror to evil doers only, yet † *Daniel* declares him to have received his Power from God, in these words; *Thou, O King, art King of Kings; for the God of Heaven hath given thee a Kingdom, Power, Strength and Glory. And wheresoever the children of Men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hands; and hath made thee Ruler over them all. And God himself * calls him his Servant, and orders all Nations to serve him and his Posterity. As Mr. H. has been told, † though he has not thought fit to take notice of it. And of the Romans our Blessed Lord is positive concerning Pilate, that his Authority was from God. Thou couldst have no † Power at all against me, except it were given thee from above. Nor is to be thought*

† Dan. 2. 37, 38. * Jer. 27. 6, 7. † Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject, p. 12. † It is ἐξουσία in the Original, the same word that is used by St. Paul in the place now under Consideration.

St. Paul would || have *appealed to Caesar*, that is, to no better a Prince than *Nero*, if he had not believed him to be *God's Ordinance*. Besides that, he blames himself for having spoken disrespectfully of the High-Priest * who had *Commanded him to be smitten contrary to the Law*, and pleads his own Ignorance in doing it. These were such Governors as I am very apt to think Mr. H. will not pretend to have answered the Character he so much insists upon, of being really and in fact, as well as in the intention of their Office, *the Ministers of God for good to them that do good, and to execute wrath upon him that doth evil*. And yet it is fully testified, That they were God's Ministers, were set up and made to Reign by him, and had all their Authority from him.

And thus being God's Ministers, though such as acted unagreeably to, and unworthily of the Charge wherewith they were entrusted, Mr. H. will find it a hard task to prove, that they were not to be Reverenced, Obeyed, and Submitted to, Actively in their Lawful Commands, and Passively where they exceeded the bounds of their Commission; or which comes to the same thing, that, they were not such Powers, as the Apostle requires Subjection to.

The Prophet *Hosea* tells the *Israelites*, † that *God gave them a King in his Anger, and took him away in his Wrath*; which words are thus Paraphrased in one of our Church's Homilies, * *God giveth a Prince in his Anger, meaning an evil one; and taketh away a Prince in his Displeasure, meaning, especially when he taketh away a good Prince, for the sins of the People*. And then it follows a little after, *Here you see that God placeth as well evil Princes as good, and for what cause he doth both*. But Mr. H. it seems understands better things; with whom a Prince is no longer to be looked upon as God's Minister, than he acts in pursuance of his Institution; and if he ventures to deviate from

|| *Act. 25. 11.* * *Act. 23. 3.* † *Hos. 13. 11.*

* *First part of the Sermon against Wilful Rebellion.*

his Rule, he loses his Authority, and is answerable for his Mis-government, not only to God, who set him in that Station ; but to All, even the Meanest of the People, † who are hereby Authorized to rise up against him, and try to shake off his Yoke.

Though I am exceedingly mistaken, if he find any such Commission given to Subjects, either in the words now under debate, or any other part of Scripture. And here I have the Authority of a Right Reverend Prelate of my side, the present Lord Bishop of Ely ; whose words are these, ‡ *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers ; to which Christian Precept there is no Exception to be found, for any Person, in any instance, from the one end of the Christian Institution to the other.*

Yet is Mr. H. so fully perswaded of the Truth of his Position, that he has said, and again || repeats it, that all we can possibly collect from the *Apostle's Injunctions in this place is, That it is the indispensable Duty of Subjects to submit themselves to such Governors, as answer the good end of their Institution ; to such Rulers as he here describes, such as are not a Terror to Good Works, but to the Evil ; such as promote the Public Good, and are continually attending upon this very thing.* This, he says, is the utmost, that there is any possibility of collecting from these Words of the Apostle. And yet he cannot but know, that more has been actually collected from them , and by abundance of very Great Men, much more Learned Divines, and of much better Judgment, as well as greater Reading, than himself can pretend to be. And they had very good Reason for it, considering that the Apostle's Argument is principally founded upon the unlawfulness of *Resisting the Powers that are ;* upon this account, that they are the *Ordinance of God.* Whence it necessarily follows, that since God sets up Wicked and Ungodly, Tyrannical and Persecuting Princes, no less than those

† P. 8. ‡ *Sermon before the Lord Mayor, Jan. 25. 1684.*

|| P. 22.

of a better Temper, and more heartily disposed to promote their Subjects Welfare, Submission is therefore due to them. Nor can they be Resisted, without *Resisting the Ordinance of God*, and thereby exposing our selves to Eternal Misery and Destruction. And what follows concerning the benefit and usefulness of Government, which Mr. H. makes his only Motive to Submission and Obedience, is only a farther collateral Consideration, for exciting to the more ready Compliance with this Institution of the Apostle, it being what every Body must acknowledge fit and reasonable, That they who ordinarily undergo a great Burden of Care and Solitude for their Subjects, and are great occasions of their Welfare, should have a suitable return of Reciprocal Fidelity and Duty from them.

Nor needed the Apostle to have declared himself more fully, supposing it to be as I have said ; because the words thus consider'd, do sufficiently put a bar to all Resistance. Mr. H. I confess, would have taught him to say, * *That the Prince acts by God's Authority, in all the instances of Oppression, Barbarity, and Violence, he could possibly be Guilty of ; as if God had given him a Commission to act in this manner.* A Doctrine that he charges others to have since taught for him ! Though I dare be confident, that amongst all the large Catalogue of Eminent Writers, that have appeared in behalf of the truly Christian, though of late unhappily exploded Doctrine of Non-resistance, he will not produce one that has said it. There is no doubt, but when a Prince goes contrary to his Duty, and the end of his Commission, he does this of himself, and not by virtue of God's Authority delegated to him. Yet since at this same instant, he is invested with God's Authority, for other better purposes, though not for these just now mention'd ; that investiture sets him above the *Peoples Opposition*, since they cannot Resist him, even in these instances, without *resisting the*

Ordinance of God ; the Sin the Apostle is here providing against. And the want of this Distinction, between the Person invested with the *Power*, and the Abuse of that Power to very different purposes, from those for which he is so invested ; the want, I say, of this Distinction has been the Foundation of Mr. H's. whole Book, and the many erroneous Assertions that occur from one end of it to the other.

Here I had thought to have concluded this Chapter ; but I find * Three other Assertions, two of them in it, and the third relating to it, which call for a particular consideration, and must not therefore be passed over without it. *Had it been St. Paul's meaning*, says Mr. H. *to press Obedience to the greatest Tyrants and Oppressors ; or had he had in his Eye any particular Emperor, who was a Monster not only of Villany, but of Publick Oppression, (as some represent his Sense ;) nothing can be imagined more unaccountable, than that he should give such a Description of Governors, as to exclude those whom there was most occasion to mention ; and that he should reason Christians into a Conscientious Subjection in such a manner, as cannot conclude for Subjection, to any but such Governors as he describes in the foregoing Words ; and as come up to that sense of them, in which he meant they should be understood.* For answer whereto,

1. Let it be observ'd, That nothing can be more unreasonable, than it is, when the Apostle requires Subjection to the *Powers that be*, to imagine as Mr. H. does, that he intended it not to be paid to the Emperor then Reigning. Nor is it possible to conceive who else should be at *Rome* the Power in being at that time.

2. If these words relate to Heathen Governors, as well as others, and to such amongst them as Reigned in the first Ages of Christianity, and especially in the time of the Apostles, (as they most certainly did) they are necessarily to be understood in

such a Sense, as may some way agree to these Governors; unless we should Represent the *Apostle* as Reasoning very Injudiciously and Absurdly. And accordingly to be a *terror not to Good Works, but to the evil*; to be the *Minister of God for Good*, and a *Revenge to execute Wrath upon him that doth Evil*, must not be thought to denote a care to protect and encourage the Profession of the Gospel, but must relate rather to the common Doctrines and Practices of Natural Religion, and more especially such Branches of it, as tend to the Security and Happiness of Society; such as ordinary Intercourse and Commerce amongst the Subjects; Submission and Obedience to Authority; Defence of the Innocent and Peaceable; Suppression of Thefts, Murders, Rebellions, Treasons, &c. These things, generally speaking, are for the Good of Society, and to maintain and help them forward is so essential a part of the Magistrate's Duty, that none of them but apply themselves to it, though too often neither so Diligently nor so Uprightly as they ought. The Generality of Governors do in a great Measure make them their Care; And there is none so bad, as not to do it in some degree, Courts of Law being open in all Nations, and Judges, and other Officers of divers kinds appointed for the Administration of Justice. Whereby many Evils are prevented, and Benefits enjoy'd, which may require some return of Gratitude and Submission. And even in the most Unhappy Circumstances, in the worst of Times, the best way to meet with Quiet, and Protection, and Encouragement, is to be Submissive to the Powers that be, and Observe all those Duties that have a more especial respect to them as Governors, though not so Good as were to be wished. And I should rather choose to understand the Words in this lax and general Sense, than strain them up with Mr. H. to such a pitch, as could in no wise suit with the *Powers in being*, when the *Apostle* lived, and to whom they

* *Eph.* 5. 25, &c.

required all Christians to be Subject; and indeed with very few since. And if we interpret the Words after this manner, as in all reason they ought to be interpreted, not only the Apostle does not *exclude those whom there was most occasion to mention*, but moreover his Reasoning in the Third and Fourth Verses, is exactly consonant with that in the Two former, which according to Mr. H's interpretation it never can be.

3. Mr. H. acknowledges, * *it is not to be suppos'd, that the Apostle meant that all of them [all Governors] did always perform this good part, [of studying continually to promote the Public Happiness] but that it was their great business, and the only end of their Institution, as he makes it the ground of the Obedience that was to be paid to them. And † as far as they deflect from God's Will, which is declar'd to be promoting the Public Good, so far he affirms them to lose their Title to these Declarations of the Apostle.* Here Mr. H. may please to tell, whether all that in any wise deflect from the Promotion of the Publick Good, though but now and then, and to no very great degree, can be said in his Sense to be *the Ministers of God for Good*, or at least to be *continually attending upon this very thing*? For I cannot well understand, how *attending continually upon it*, and sometimes *deflecting from it*, can agree to the same Person. I would gladly learn of him also, Whether upon every such *Deflection* they cease to be the *Ministers of God*, and so become Resistible. If they do, what Governor ever was there in the World, that did not sometimes fall into this condition, and cease to be *God's Ordinance*? If they do not, how does Mr. H's stricter Sense of these words agree to these, any more than it does to worse Governors? These latter indeed appear less mindful of their People and their Duty, than the other; but if the former cease to be *God's Ministers*, these others can do no more. One Question more

* P. 4. † P. 7.

I would beg leave to ask of Mr. *H.* in this Place ; Were *Trajan* and the *Antonines*, and those other of the *Roman* Emperors, who were singularly remarkable for their moral Virtues and their earnest Endeavours and constant Solicitude to advance the *Roman* Glory, and carry it to the highest Pitch, but yet at the same time persecuted the Christians to a great Degree ; were these the Ministers of God or not ? They did certainly attend to their Government, and study the Welfare and Happiness of their People, to the best of their Judgment, and as the Laws of the Empire directed : So far were they from seeking entirely to ruin the Society. And yet they were professed Enemies to Christ, and sought the Ruin of his Church and Religion, and actually destroyed great Numbers of his most faithful Disciples ; in which it is certain they grossly *deflected from the Will of God*, and so according to Mr. *H.* *so far lost their Title to these Declarations of the Apostle*, and to the Obedience required to the Magistrate as *God's Ordinance*. Here therefore I am at a great loss to find out, according to Mr. *H's*. Principles, how a sincere and good Christian ought to have demeaned himself towards them ; whether he was to obey them as the Ministers of God, whilst they persecuted his Church ; or whether they were to be resisted, perhaps deposed, whilst they made it their constant Business, not *entirely to ruin the Safety and Happiness of the Society*, but to promote its Grandeur, extend its Dominions, and enlarge its Authority to the utmost of their Power.

4. Had the Apostle taught Resistance to bad Governors, as Mr. *H.* would have him, this had been as * *Origen* observes, the readiest Way he could have taken to justify all the Persecutions that were at any time raised against the Christians, namely by making them declared Enemies to all Governors whom they did not believe rightly to answer the End of their Institution, which according to Mr. *H's*. Doctrine no

* *In Rom.* 13. 5, 6.

Heathen Emperour could do ; because no Heathen Emperour could set himself with all his Might to promote and encourage Christianity, which is the best Way of promoting the *publick Happiness* of any Nation. This would have represented the Gospel as a dangerous System of Religion, *hurtful to Kings and Princes*, even to all the Kings and Princes in the World during the first three hundred Years after Christ ; and the Christians as a seditious Set of Men, whose Business it must be to incense Subjects against their Sovereigns, and to raise Insurrections and Rebellions wheresoever they came. Which would have given their Enemies at all Times such a Handle against them, as they could never meet with even under their sharpest and most outrageous Persecutions ; under all which the Christians thought themselves indispensably obliged, to follow their blessed Saviour's Example, * *who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, threatned not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously*. Nor would they take upon them to defend themselves against their lawful Governors, tho' when they were grown very numerous and powerful, as shall be shewn in its proper Place.

There is also another Passage in this Chapter that must be considered, lest Mr. *H.* should complain of me, as he does of others, for not attending to his Answers. I mentioned St. *Paul's* Appeal to *Nero*, as an Acknowledgment of his Divine Authority. But this Argument Mr. *H.* had spoken to, *P.* 27. and thither therefore I must follow him. *His* [the Apostle's] *appealing to the Courts of Judicature at Rome, which he did out of Choice, and not as a Point of Duty ; this, says Mr. H. can prove nothing, but that he was always ready to insist upon his Right and Liberty, as he was a Roman born, and thought himself more likely to have Justice done him there, than at Jerusalem*. Where it is observable, Mr. *H.* slides off from *Cæsar*, to whom

* 1 Pet. 2. 23.

the Appeal was made, to the Courts of Judicature at Rome; as if they had been a distinct Power from that of the Emperour, and had not acted only by his Commission. Which since they certainly did, this shews St. Paul to have believed Nero had yet Authority to do him Justice; and by Consequence that he might yet *be called God's Vicegerent* * without the highest Prophane^{ne}ss, and at this Time was really so; unless we would suppose the Apostle to appeal to one whom he knew not to be *God's Minister*, but rather † the *Minister of the Devil*. Nor does the Instance of St. Paul and Silas's Behaviour towards the Magistrates at Philippi, *Acts* 16. 37. in the least contradict this; all that can be inferred from that being only, that they had misapplied their Authority in binding uncondemn'd Romans; not that they had no Authority to bind others, who were neither Romans, nor uncondemned. Mr. H. was hard put to it, when he chose to write at this rate.

Well, but there is another Passage yet remaining, which deserves, if any thing in his whole Book, to be well considered. It is objected to him, as he notes, p. 28. of the *Preface* to the Second Edition of his *Measures*, &c. that the *Apostle useth two different Arguments, of which, says he, I consider but one, neglecting the other wholly. The One is taken, they say, from the Divine Authority of Magistrates; the other from the Usefulness of their Office to Humane Society.* A very material Objection! and which any one upon the first reading of the Words may see to be well grounded, and unanswerable. Mr. H. himself confesses the *Duty of Submission and Non-resistance* || is laid down in such absolute Terms; that many have been induced from hence, to think, that the Christian Religion denies the Subject all Liberty of redressing the greatest Grievances; which, if he mean of redressing them by Arms and Violence, is most true. And again, that ‡ those who do not examine into the Foun-

* *Vindication*, p. 25. † P. 114. || P. 5. ‡ P. 6.

dation upon which the Apostle builds this Doctrine, and into the whole of what he delivers, that is, who do not read the Words with Mr. H's. Spectacles, and prefer his Comment before the plain Text it self, may indeed be apt to think that in these Words there is little Relief allowed to Subjects, tho' lying under the greatest Oppressions imaginable. Yet Mr. H. bears up manfully against the Apostle, and like one who scorns to be baffled. Yet, says he, yet, notwithstanding the Words are thus clearly against all Resistance, methinks on the other hand. What in Contradiction to the Apostle? This is somewhat that is very particular. But what is it Mr. H. thinks on the other hand? Why no less than this: If the Apostle had done nothing but enforced the Duty of Obedience upon the Subject, it would be reasonable to judge from the Nature of the Thing, and the Absurdity of the contrary, that he meant this only as a general Rule in all ordinary Cases, rather than to imagine that he should absolutely conclude whole Nations under Misery and Slavery, without Hopes of Redress. Which is neither more, nor less, than that, be the Apostle's Words ever so plain in themselves, yet if the natural Importance of them do not suit with Mr. H's. Scheme of Government, it is unreasonable, and some other Sense right or wrong must be put upon them. And so Mr. H's Measures of Submission must be the Test to try the Apostle's Doctrine by; and not the Apostle's Doctrine the Test of his Measures. But this only by the Way. Let us now see what ~~an~~ Answer he returns to the Objection.

1. The First is this; *granting this to be true, that the Apostle makes use of two Arguments against Resistance, and yet Mr. H. takes Notice only of one of them; granting this, I say, to be true, nothing can follow from hence in Favour of Absolute Non-resistance; for I, as it follows, have sufficiently shewn in the following Treatise, that as the Argument taken from the Usefulness of their Office cannot hold good, when they are the Plagues and Destroyers of Humane Society;*
so

so the Argument drawn from their Divine Authority, cannot hold good in those Cases, in which they cannot be said to act by a Divine Authority without Blasphemy. In which Answer of his I can see nothing but what I have already disprov'd in this Chapter, and I shall not trouble the Reader with a needless Repetition.

2. He says in the next Place, *It is manifest that they are not really two distinct Arguments, nor doth it appear St. Paul makes them two distinct Arguments, but rather that he resolves all into the Usefulness of their Office, which is the only Proof he gives of their being ordained of God, viz. as it is his Will that an Office so useful to Society should be kept up, and submitted to, in the World. Nor can any of the present Rulers of this World pretend to any other Divine Right, or Divine Authority, but what results from the Usefulness of their Office to Humane Society. And this is the only Proof he gives of this groundless Assertion. It is for his Purpose that the Usefulness of Government, and a Divine Commission for it, should be all one; and tho' they are in their own Nature as clearly distinguished as can be, and are used distinctly by the Apostle, he is pleased however magisterially to affirm they are not distinct, but one and the same Thing. He is resolved they shall be the same, and therefore they must be so. But if any be so obstinate as not to take his Word for it, he must not expect to have it proved, because it is false, and cannot be proved.*

3. He adds, that if their acting by Authority from God in some Cases, be sufficient to establish absolute Non-resistance in all Cases, it will likewise as effectually establish absolute Active Obedience in all Cases. But how comes Mr. H. to talk at this rambling rate? He cannot be ignorant, and I am sure he ought not to have forgot, that the Scripture has undoubtedly limited our Active Obedience by teaching to * obey God rather than Man. Which Direction is a sufficient Bar

* Acts 5. 29.

to an *Active Obedience* to any unlawful Command, tho' of the greatest Monarch upon Earth. But can Mr. *H.* shew a like Prohibition of suffering Persecution in any Case? He is wiser, I dare say, than to pretend to it. Yet till he can, he must own the Case is not at all parallel, and in short that this Argument is no Argument at all.

4. He makes the * Case of one's own Natural Prince, and that of an Invader to be all one, not considering that howsoever the Invading Prince be the *Minister of God* in his own Dominions, and to those committed to his Charge, this does not make him so to others who have no Relation to him, nor owe him any Sort of Allegiance. Whence as an *English Subject* owes him no Duty in any respect, so in particular he is under no Obligation to forbear resisting his Invasion. So far from this, that on the contrary, the Allegiance Subjects owe to their proper Sovereign, obliges them in Duty to oppose and resist such an Invader, according to their Station and Ability, and so long as they can hope to do any Service by it. So that whatever Force there is in this Argument, it can be of no Use to Mr. *H.* in as much as, instead of a Parallel, it proves rather a contradictory Instance; and instead of favouring his Cause, weakens, if not totally destroys it. For it will by no Means follow, that because I may resist an invading Prince, in Defence of my own Sovereign, therefore I may resist my own Sovereign too. The Argument is much stronger on the other hand, That because I am indispensably bound to adhere to my Prince against such an Invader, therefore I may not resist Him or Her, in any other Case.

So that upon the whole Matter, as I think I have fully proved Obedience and Submission to be required by the Apostle, to Governors in general, and like that of Servants to their Masters, *not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward*, and chiefly

* As he does also p. 110, 111, of his Vindication.

upon account of their Divine Commission ; so I must freely own, I can find nothing in all Mr. *H.* offers to the contrary, that is any manner of Disproof of it.

C H A P. III.

Whether the Higher Powers are from God, only so far as they act agreeably to his Will, and study to promote the Happiness of humane Society ?

I Proceed now to Mr. *H.*'s. Third Position, namely, That *these Higher Powers are from God*, [that is to say, only] *as they act agreeably to his Will, which is, that they should promote the Happiness and Good of humane Society, which St. Paul all along supposes them to do. And consequently, when they do the contrary, they cannot be said to be from God, or to act by his Authority, any more than an inferior Magistrate may be said to act by a Prince's Authority, whilst he acts directly contrary to his Will.* Here is the same Mistake I have before taken Notice of, namely by confounding God's Ordinance, and the Exercise, or rather the Abuse of Authority. The Ruler is *God's Ordinance*, and derives his Authority from him. This Mr. *H.* does not pretend to deny. Only because the Prince's Authority is given him, for the Good, and Safety, and Welfare of the Community, therefore he ceases in Mr. *H.*'s. Opinion to be any longer God's Ordinance, or to have any farther Authority from him, when once he ceases to Govern as he ought.

But

But now (not to insist upon the Authorities of great Men, such as * *Origen*, † *St. Ambrose*, and † *St. Jerome*) where is the Consequence of this? *St. Paul*, I am sure, says no such Thing; nor will *Mr. H.* be able to prove it by any other Medium. Husband and Wife are united in Matrimony, amongst other Purposes, for the mutual Society and Comfort of each other. But suppose the Effect prove otherwise, and they become mutual Crosses and Vexations to one another, they do not hereby cease to be Man and Wife. *St. Paul* commands all married Men, to be tender and loving to their Wives, as our Saviour loved his Church, and to cherish them as their own Flesh, and not be cross and peevish towards them.

* Dicet fortasse aliquis; Quid ergo? Et illa potestas quæ Dei servos persequitur, fidem impugnât, religionem subvertit, à Deo est? Ad hoc breviter respondebimus. Nemo est qui nesciat, quoniam & visus nobis à Deo donatus est, & auditus & sensus. Cum ergo hæc à Deo in potestate nostrâ sint, tamen uti visu vel ad bona vel ad mala possumus: Similiter & auditu, & motu manuum, & cogitatione sensûs: Et in hoc justum judicium Dei est, quoniam his quos ad usus ille bonos dedit, nos abutimur ad impia & iniqua ministeria. Ita ergo & potestas omnis à Deo data est, ad vindictam quidem malorum, laudem vero bonorum, sicut idem Apostolus in subsequentibus dicit. Erit autem justum judicium Dei erga eos qui acceptam potestatem secundum suas impietates, & non secundum divinas temperant leges. *Orig. in Ep. ad Rom. cap. 13. lib. 9. ex Edit. Io. Parv.*

† A Deo potestatum ordinatio, à malo ambitio potestatis. — Non est, inquit, potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinatæ sunt: Non datæ, sed ordinatæ. Et qui resistit potestati, Dei, inquit, ordinationi resistit. — Nec potestas mala, sed is qui malè utitur potestate. *B. Ambros. Comment. lib. 4. in Evang. Lu. cap. 4.*

‖ Si de seculi potestatibus dicere videatur, non ideo justæ erunt, etiam si a Deo exordium acceperunt; secundum desiderium unius cujusque dantur. Nam dicit Salomon; quoniam data est nobis potestas à Deo. Sed cum essetis ministri regni illius, non rectè judicâstis. Horrendè & cito apparebit vobis, &c. *B. Hieron. in loc.*

† *Hus-*

* *Husbands*, says the Apostle, *love your Wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word: That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without Blemish. So ought Men to love their Wives, as their own Bodies; he that loveth his Wife, loveth himself. For no Man ever yet hated his own Flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. For we are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones. For this Cause shall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and be joined to his Wife, and they two shall be one Flesh. This is a great Mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his Wife, even as himself. And at another time, says the same Apostle, † *Husbands love your Wives, and be not bitter against them.* And other Places there are in Scripture, where the Duty of Husbands is inculcated, and which they cannot disobey without contradicting the Ends of their Matrimony. Yet cannot Mr. H. say, that those who do so, are not the Husbands the Apostle speaks of, and therefore the Wife is at Liberty, whensoever she meets with a cross, vexatious, unkind, turbulent, and surly Husband, to shake him off, and be married to another. Yet the Case is exactly parallel, saving that the Husband, is not so till he has stipulated with the Wife, in a very solemn Manner, before God and the Congregation, to perform what is thus required of him, and they have been joined together by the Priest, according to God's holy Ordinance. Whereas no Stipulation is required to constitute a King, who is as much so before Coronation, or any Oath taken, as afterwards; and tho' he be never Crowned at all, and so, have never, during all his Reign, entred into any formal Obligation to his People. So that the Obligation is plainer and more conspicuous on the*

* *Eph. 5. 25, &c.* † *Col. 3. 19.*

Husband's Side, than on the Prince's; and if the Violation hereof does not hinder the one to be a Husband, why must it then make the other cease to be a Prince?

There is a Case, I grant; that of Adultery, which our * Saviour allows to be a just Cause of dissolving the Conjugal Bond. And when Mr. *H.* can produce any like Exception, as to the Sovereignty of the Prince, I will readily yield him to have Reason on his Side. But 'till then I hope he will excuse me, if I believe the Sovereign's Misgovernment does no more dissolve the mutual Relation, that is betwixt Himself and his People, than Adultery would have dissolved the Matrimonial Relation, supposing our Saviour had made no more Exception to that, than he has done to any other Difference that may happen between the married Couple.

Thus Servants are enjoin'd by our Apostle, † to be *obedient to their Masters according to the Flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of Heart, as unto Christ, &c.* And their Masters are required on the other hand, to do good Offices to their Servants, being favourable and gentle towards them, considering the Relation they both stand in to the Almighty God. || *Ye Masters, do the same things to them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in Heaven, neither is there respect of Persons with him.* Now when Masters answer this Obligation, there is no manner of Doubt, but their Servants are engaged to shew all Fidelity towards them, to be obedient to their Commands, and carefully perform the Work they are retained for. But does it hence follow on the other hand, that if the Master does not *forbear threatening*, if he does not *do the same things to his Servants*, but uses them ill, is churlish and harsh, and very difficult to be pleased by all their heartiest Endeavours to serve him, that this

* *Mat.* 5. 32. † *Eph.* 6, 5, 6, 7, 8, *Col.* 3. 22, 23, 24. *Tit.* 2. 9, 10. || *Eph.* 6. 7.

*is not the Master St. Paul describes ; (for he declares him to be one that must use his Servants well, and particularly must forbear Threatning) and consequently not the Master to whom he here presses Obedience, and therefore the Servants may conspire together to turn him out of Doors, at least may bid him Defiance and refuse to serve him any longer ? According to Mr. H's. Casuistry, * it must be so, and Servants are highly to blame if they do not shake off their Master's Yoke, and set themselves free. † A Passive-Non-Resistance would appear upon Examination, if Mr. H. may determine the Case, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary. And yet not only St. Paul says no such thing, in all he at any Time discourses of the Duty of Masters and Servants ; but besides, St. Peter declares himself of a quite contrary Judgment, commanding Submission and Obedience even to these unworthy Masters ; tho' not for their own ; yet for God's Sake, and out of respect to his Injunction, after the same manner as St. Paul teaches Subjection to bad Governors, not upon their own Account, but because they are the Ordinance of God. His Words are these ; || Servants, be subject to your Masters, with all Fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a Man for Conscience toward God endure Grief, suffering wrongfully. For what Glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your Faults, ye take it patiently ? but if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. Words so full and clear, and so unquestionable a Confutation of that Sense of St. Paul's fore-mention'd Injunctions, to which Mr. H's. Method of interpreting would lead, that nothing could be more. In answer to this Mr. H. argues, ‡ that St. Peter advises Slaves, who were in a State of perfect Captivity, had forfeited their Lives, and were bought with a Price into the Arbitrary Power of their Masters, to bear with the evil Treat-*

* *Vindicat.* p. 21. † *Serm.* p. 8. || *1 Pet.* 2. 18, 19, 20.
‡ *P.* 128. 129.

ment of their Masters, &c. Whereas Subjects generally speaking, are not in a State of Captivity, never forfeited their Lives and Fortunes to their Prince, nor ever were bought with a Price into their Arbitrary Power. And this is to pass for an Answer to what is alledged from St. Peter, and Mr. H. thinks it very unreasonable that it should not be thought a good one. But sure he has not quite forgot that there are other Servants besides Slaves; nor can he deny that they are concerned in this Injunction of the Apostle. Let him therefore reflect upon this, and then tell us whether the Cases be so different, as he would have it thought they are.

But it is not only in the fore-mentioned Instances, but Multitudes of others that might be produced, where an Institution is not vacated by the ill Management of the Person entrusted with it. If a General, instead of fighting the Enemy, spends his Time in plundering, abusing, and tyrannizing over his Friends, and committing all Sorts of Outrages, none can deny that he deserves to be severely punished for such abominable Misbehaviour; yet all this does not hinder his being a General, nor discharge his Soldiers from obeying his lawful Orders, till his Command shall be taken from him.

The Case is the same also with a Judge, who is appointed for the Good of the People, that he may do right to the Injured, may preserve Peace, and punish Malefactors. For be he never so partial and unjust in his Decisions of whatsoever kind, tho' this makes a corrupt Judge, and justly deserving to be displaced, and called to account for his Proceedings, yet so long as he continues in Commission, he is still a Judge, tho' a very bad one, and his Determinations are all valid in Law, till reversed by some other Sentence.

The Lord Mayor, no one doubts, is chosen for the Good of the City, and acts under his Sovereign to this End, and is * sworn faithfully to discharge his Office accordingly; yet be his Administration ever

* *Book of Oaths*, p. 253.

so bad, and ever so much Disorder be occasioned by it ; this does not put an End to his Mayoralty, till he shall be legally dispossest of it.

And yet to come nearer home, I shall add one other familiar Instance. Mr. *H.* at his Ordination undertook to * *give faithful Diligence, always so to minister the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as the Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; and to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines, contrary to God's Word.* And these were Conditions whereupon he was admitted to his sacred Office, and as much incumbent upon him, as to promote the publick Welfare, and be a *Minister of God* to the People for good, and a *Terror to evil Doers*, is upon the Magistrate. And to this End likewise he was instituted into his Parish of *St. Peter the Poor*. And if however it shall be found, that he has acted contrary to the Design of his Promotion, by broaching and endeavouring to defend, instead of condemning, opposing, and using his hearty Endeavours, to suppress erroneous Doctrines, and particularly in the Case now under Debate, will he own it to be a good Consequence, that he is not the Priest whom the Ordinal takes him to be, nor the Rector the Bishop expected him to be, and therefore he is no Priest of God, and so all his Administrations null and delusory, or that he is no longer Rector of the said Parish, nor any of the Parishioners to own him as such, or to pay him their Tithes? I cannot find out a Difference betwixt this way of arguing, and his own; nor any Reason, why a wicked Ruler should not still remain *God's Ordinance*, how unworthy soever of so high an Honour, as well as Mr. *H.* remains a Parish-Priest upon this Supposition. And he must therefore either quit his Rectory, and lay aside his Orders, or renounce this

* See Form and Manner of ordaining Priests.

his beloved Notion. For to use his own * Argument, he is a Minister, and Minister of that Parish in particular, *as he acts agreeably to God's Will, which is, that he should take Care to minister that Doctrine, &c. which the Lord hath commanded, and this Church and Realm hath received. And consequently when he does the contrary, he cannot be said to be God's Priest, or to act by his Commission, any more than an inferiour Magistrate may be said to act by his Prince's Authority, whilst he acts directly contrary to his Will.* For as far as he deserts from God's Will, so far he loses his Title to his sacred Character and Office. Into this Dilemma Mr. H. has undoubtedly brought himself, supposing his Doctrine prove false : And here therefore, I leave it to his own Ingenuity to extricate himself, as well as he can, and proceed to what follows.

No Prince, says Mr. H. surely will own him for his Viceroy, who being sent into a Province to do Justice, sets himself to do all the Injustice possible. Where if he had said, no Prince who sends a Viceroy on Purpose to do Justice, will continue him any longer in his Office, when it comes to be known that he employs his Power to do all the Injustice he can, this were a reasonable Assertion, and what any one must assent to. But that the *Prince will not own him for his Viceroy whilst he is so, whilst he bears his Character, and has his Commission to act by, if he would pursue the Design of it, is a new Discovery, and it is fit Mr. H. should be allowed the Honour of having first hit upon it.*

But he offers to prove it too. And in truth, his Discovery, and his Argument for the Proof of it, are so well suited to each other, that it is great Pity they should be parted. And therefore I shall here subjoin it in his own Words, † *He who acts farther than his Commission bears him out, is not in those Actions his Prince's Viceroy, because it is the Commission only that makes him so, and in these Actions he is without Com-*

* *Vindicat.* p. 24. † *Ibid.* p. 26.

mission. As if he had no Commission at all from his Prince, because he has none for his Injustice. But how doth this appear? This is a good Proof that the Miscarriages of the Viceroy lie all upon himself, and no way affect his Prince, who expected none of them, and is not therefore chargeable with them. But how does it follow, that the Viceroy is not still Viceroy, till his Commission is revoked? Which was the Point Mr. *H.* undertook to assert; or that being Viceroy, he was not to have all the Obedience paid him that is due to all that are so? Which was intended to be implied; and which the following Words apply, tho' without any good Reason for it, to a Sovereign Prince, whom he will not allow to be God's Viceroy, and accountable to him only as such, because there are certain Cases, and possibly of dangerous Consequence, wherein he acts unagreeably to the Trust reposed in him, and the high Character he bears.

But Mr. *H.* tells us in another Place, that * *He [S. Paul] hath his Eye all the way upon the End of Government, and founds his Precepts upon this Supposition, that the Rulers answer that good End. If they do not; or if they set themselves to contradict it by Oppression, Violence, and Injustice, by invading and destroying the publick Happiness, and by bringing on publick Miseries; the Apostle seems not to think of recommending Submission to the Subject, &c.* But to whom doth this seem? To Mr. *H.* perhaps, and such as are resolved to see but on one Side. But would he be prevailed with, seriously and impartially to consider his Text, I am verily persuaded, the Apostle would more than seem to recommend Subjection to all lawful Sovereigns whatsoever; and not only so, but to enforce it with no less a Penalty, than eternal *Damnation* to such as shall resist them. The Words are so very plain, that by whatsoever Artifice the Force of them can be evaded, by the same Way any other Denunciation in

* *Serm.* p. 9.

Scripture ~~may~~ ^{be} made of none Effect. And could Mr. *H.* have found in his Heart, to have tried his Skill in the Defence of Image-Worship, Duels, or Fornication, as contradictory as they are to the Second, Sixth and Seventh Commandment, he might as easily have performed that Undertaking, and proved each of these to be according to Scripture, as he can prove the Apostle not to have thought of recommending *Submission to bad Governors*, in his Text, whensoever it shall please God to set such over us. The Apostle speaks of the Benefits of Government, for encouraging to the more chearful Obedience to Authority ; but that he had such an *Eye upon the End of Government*, as to make that the sole, or indeed the chief Ground of Submission to Governors, is what Mr. *H.* has not yet proved, nor will ever be able to do it. And yet if he could have done what is thus impossible, it would not have been enough to answer his Design. For he has already been told, * that *God gives a Man Riches and Honour*, as well as Power, not only for his own Sake but for the Good of others, and that he is to use them accordingly for the Relief, and Assistance, and Benefit of his Neighbours, and by no means to their Oppression and Wrong. Yet if he abuse the Advantages he enjoys above those round about him to these ill Purposes, he does not thereupon forfeit his Estate and Title to them. And Mr. *H.* would have done well to shew how the supream Power comes to be more forfeitable than these.

He adds, † *Some say that St. Paul calls Nero, who was a Monster of Wickedness, and exercised the greatest Cruelties and Barbarities, the Minister of God, even in the Execution of all his Villanies; and then prays God to forgive those who say so.* Which Words may either mean, as he seems to have intended them, that *Nero* acted all his Outrages in Pursuance of his Commission from Almighty God ; and then I know not who it is Mr. *H.* prays for ; I am sure I cannot find it in the

* *Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject*, p. 12. † *P. 26.*

Enquiry referred to in the Margin. And I believe Mr. *H.* will be hard put to it, to name any other Author on whom he can fairly fix this Charge. Or else the Words may mean, that *Nero* had God's Commission, and was *God's Minister*, whilst he acted so very unagreeably to his Station. And if this be the right exposition of them, I am apt to think that I may come into the Number of those, for whom Mr. *H.* is so charitable an Intercessor. I cannot pretend to determine, * whether the Epistle to the *Romans* was written in *Nero's* Reign, or his Predecessor *Claudius's*; nor is it much Material in which, they being both bad enough: But whether-soever of them was then in the Throne, it is very hard to imagine how Mr. *H.* will be able to make it out that he was not at that time the *Higher Power*. And if this be once granted, it will be very easie to shew

* *Corintho Scriptam fuisse insignem illam ad Romanos Epistolam, An. Per. Jul. 4773. Ær. Christ. 60; (i. e. Neronis Sexto.) Usser. Annal. To. poster. p. 674. Paulus Corintho scribit Epistolam ad Romanos. Pearson. Annal. Paulin. Christ. 57. Ner. 3. Il écrivit la lettre aux Romains vers la fin da l'année 57, ou au commencement de la 58 de nôtre ere. Du Pin Dissert. Prelim. sur la Bible, Part. 2. Sect 8. p. 48. et Dissert. Prelim. sur les Auteurs des livres de la Bible. Sect. 5. p. 67. Epist. ad Rom. an. 54 scripta. Cav. hist. liter. p. 6. Ann. 4005 post Chr. 56, scripsit Epistolam ad Romanos. Seth. Calvis. Op. Chronol. p. 448. Christi 58. Neron. secundo. Origenes eam Epistolam apud Corinthum Scriptam esse concludit, cui nos etiam assentimur. Baron. Annal. 58. n. 46. From Corinth in his short stay there, he writeth the Epistle to the Romans, as hath been well supposed, &c. Chr. 56. Ner. 2. Lightfoot Harm. of N. Test. Act. ch. 20. Coming again to Corinth, he wrote this to the Romans, a little before the Emperor Claudius's Death,† Dr. Hammond Annot. on the Title to the Rom. This is commonly acknowledged to have been written under the Reign of Nero. Dr. Falkner of Christian Loyalty, L. 2. C. 4. It must be written A. D. 57. the Fourth year of Nero. Dr. Whitby. 57 or 58. B^p Lloyd.*

*† which is placed by Chronologer
in the 55th year of Christ*

him

him from St. *Paul*, that the same was the *Ordinance of God*. Nor is it possible, without great Violence and Distortion, to put any Interpretation upon the Apostle's Words, *There is no Power but of God, and the Powers that be are ordain'd of God*, that shall not include the Emperor then upon the Throne.

Mr. *H.* seems to lay a great deal of stress * upon our Saviour's calling *Herod Fox*, and St. *Paul*'s saying he was delivered out of the Mouth of the *Lion*; as if they accounted Oppressive and Persecuting Governors, so far from acting by God's Authority, as that they were to be looked upon as degenerated into the worst of Beasts. Here our Saviour Represents *Herod*'s Subtilty by that of a *Fox*, and St. *Paul* the Emperor's Cruelty by that of a *Lion*; and this must be taken for a Proof that they were no longer *God's Ordinance*; because they abused the Power committed to them, and thereby deserv'd these hard Names. This I grant, shewed they were to be looked upon as bad Governors; but not as no Governors at all. Sure Arguments run very low, when such as these have so much weight laid upon them. One would think, says Mr. *H.* That it was their Opinion, that the *Lion and Fox* had as much real Authority, to commit their Depredations, as a Cunning and Powerful Prince hath to act his Violences. A very Rational Inference! A Bad Governor cannot be like either of these Beasts in Subtilty or Rapine, but he must inevitably have as little of Authority as they. As necessary a Consequence as that *Tenterdon* Steeple made *Goodwyn* Sands.

I shall take notice of nothing more under this Head, but only his unhandsom Reflection upon *David*'s Carriage towards *Saul*, and another (whether meer Calumny or not, I desire him seriously to consider) upon the Writers in behalf of Non-resistance. † *David*, he pleads, opposed *Saul* at the Hazard of the Public Peace. And yet we do not find the least Violence attempted by him against his Sovereign,

* P. 27, 28. † P. 28.

though himself appointed by God to Succeed him in the Government. Mr. H. * had been told, if he would have been pleas'd to take Notice of it, what might have silenc'd him as to this Plea, and the rather because coming with the Authority of a *Reverend Prelate*, for whom I hope he has no mean Regard, it being in the words of the Lord Bishop of Sarum, that Saul was at first Constituted King by Samuel, acting in the Name of the Lord: And when he had Reigned Two years, the same Samuel, in the Name of the same God, before the same People, denounces Publickly that his Kingdom should not continue; and that God had sought a Man after his own Heart, because he invaded the Priests Office. After this, he limits a certain day; He tells him, This day the Lord hath rent the Kingdom of Israel from thee, and given it thy Neighbour; because of his Rebellion against God in the case of Amalek. The Pretence of Failure and Forfeiture can go no higher. Now for the pretences of David to step into his Government, and to wrest it from him. He was anointed by Samuel, for ought appears, without Reservation for the Life of Saul. He was qualified for Government, a Valiant Man, a Man of War, Prudent in Matters, a comely Person, and the Lord was with him. He had received Testimony from God of his Election. The Spirit of God departed from Saul, and rested upon him. He had Power in his hand, he was set over the Men of War, accepted by all the People, All Israel and Judea loved him. After all this, you know his Provocations, his Advantages, and his Behaviour. He durst not touch the Lord's Anointed. And when another pretended to have done it at Saul's entreaty in extremis, he revenged his Death and lamented over him. Ye Mountains of Gilboa, &c. Whereto I shall add the words of the Learned Bishop Stillingfleet; † David himself, though anointed to be King, Persecuted by Saul, and though he might have pleaded Necessity and

* St. Paul, no mover of Sedition, P. 15. 16.

† Serm. 7. P. 110.

Providence, *as much as any ever could*, (*when Saul was strangely deliver'd in^{to} his hands*) yet we see what an Opinion he had of the Person of a bad King; † The Lord forbid that I should do this thing against my Master, the Lord's Anointed, to stretch forth my hand against him, seeing he is the Anointed of the Lord. *And lest we should think, it was only his Modesty or his Policy which kept him from doing it, he afterwards upon a like occasion declares, it was only the Sin of doing it, which kept him from it.* ‡ For who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's Anointed and be guiltless? His Heart smote him || for but cutting off the Skirt of Saul's Garmēt, in the Wilderness of Engedi, when he had him at an advantage, that seemed to be put into his hand by a particular Providence, and he could as easily have killed him if he durst. And when it pleas'd God a Second time to deliver Saul in like manner into his Hand, as he lay asleep in his Trench, and Abishai would have invited him to hearken to the call of so extraordinary a Providence, and avenge himself of so implacable an Enemy, David consider'd, though he was his Enemy, yet he was his Sovereign too, and would by no means do him any harm. * Abishai said to David, † God hath deliver'd thine Enemy into thine

† 1 Sam. 24. 6. ‡ 1 Sam. 26. 9. || 1 Sam. 24. 4.
* 1 Sam. 26. 8, 9, 10, 11.

† Abishai would fain have Perswaded him to it. And it was said to him, upon a like Occasion, Behold the Day, of which the Lord hath said unto thee, I will deliver thine Enemy into thy Hand, that thou may'st do to him, as it shall seem good unto thee. *Would not a Whigg have thought this a full Commission? And a Contempt of Providence to neglect the Opportunity? And it was God himself who gave that Opportunity, by causing a Deep Sleep to fall upon them. And it seems there was a Prophecy of this given to David, for it is said, Behold the Day, of which the Lord said unto thee— But David thought, not even a Prophecy, no nor the Act of God in causing a Deep Sleep to fall on his Enemy, would*

warrant his taking that Opportunity to Resist his Prince, or those Commission'd by him. It might be a Trial to David, to see if his Loyalty could be shaken; And for an Example to future Ages. And David did thus Determine it, &c. The Good old Cause Discussed, P. 11, 12.

thine hand this Day; now therefore I pray thee let me smite him with the Spear, even to the Earth at once, and I will not smite him the second time. * And David said to Abishai, destroy him not; for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's Anointed and be guiltless? David said furthermore, as the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him, or his day shall come to die, or he shall descend into the Battel and Perish. The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth mine hand to destroy the Lord's anointed. And afterwards † when the Amalekite came to bring him the news of Saul's Death, in expectation no doubt of a bountiful Reward for the glad tidings of David's Deliverance from so bitter an Enemy, and that the Kingdom was now devolv'd upon him, yet forasmuch as he owned himself to have been an Instrument of Compleating the Death of Saul, tho' not till he had first fallen upon his Spear, see how like one that had been a most Faithful Subject, David resents this Usage of Saul, though from an Alien, who owed him no Natural Allegiance; ‡ David took hold on his Clothes and rent them, and likewise all the Men that were with him, and they mourned and wept, and fasted until Even. || And David called one of the young Men, and said, go near and fall upon him. And he smote him that he died. And David said unto him, Thy Blood be upon thy head, for thy Mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord's anointed. This was David's Dutiful Carriage towards Saul, notwithstanding all the ill usage he had met with from him, and

* Οὐ μόνον αὐτὸς ἐχ' ἡψατο τῆς πολεμίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέροις βαλόνibus ἐκάλυσε, σωματοβύλας ἀντὶ πολεμίας χιτῶνος, καὶ δορυφόροις ἄριστοι. B. Chrysost. εἰς τὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ ὡς τὸ Σαὺλ. λαγ. β. † 2 Sam. I. 4. ‡ V. 11, 12. || V. 15, 16.

notwithstanding the Character himself bare at that time, of a more than ordinary Person, because expressly design'd by Almighty God, for the Government of his People *Israel*. And I should be glad to know of Mr. *H.* whether such a Harmless Deportment towards a Cruel and Persecuting King be all the Opposition he pleads for. If it be, this will never answer his aim, of promoting the *Public Good*, by easing the Community of a Tyrannical, Imperious, and Destructive Governor. And if it be not, as it is plain enough it is not, his introducing *David* here as an example of the Resistance he contends for, can serve to no other end, than merely to amuze the unwary Reader, by offering something he would have thought to the purpose, when it is not.

Yet says Mr. *H.* * *If his [a Subject's] single Life is unjustly sought after, if he should fly about with a Body of armed Men, and defend him from all who would attack him, I cannot say but he hath David's example to bear him out, who Opposed Saul in a single instance of Injustice, at the hazard of the Public Peace.* Whereas I have shewn that *David* would do no Mischief to Saul. And if he had a Body of Soldiers about him for his Guard, against the attempts of any that might Privily seek to take away his Life, this however will warrant none other to do the like, who is not so immediately chosen by God himself, and anointed to be a Governor as he was. Or if Mr. *H.* thinks it would, this would justify any Subject whatsoever, that apprehends himself in Danger from his Prince, in betaking himself to Arms: And so we should have the World brought to a fine pass.

Again, Mr. *H.* affirms, † that the Cause between Saul and David being purely Personal, and of a Private Concern; and the Charge against Saul relating merely to his Personal Vices, all that can follow from hence, supposing the Example of David to oblige our Consciences, is this, That it is not lawful for Subjects to dethrone or murder a Prince, for Vices merely personal, or on any

* *Vind.* p. 21. † P. 165, 166.

account of a private Nature. But let Mr. H. speak out. Is this all? Were *Saul's* Faults meerly personal? Was not his Management such as * had provoked God to cast him ~~off~~ off, and appoint another to succeed him? If Mr. H. could have said so much of any modern Prince, how would he have triumphed over any one that should have pretended to say, that he was irresistible, and had not lost all the Authority he could ever be pretended to have received from God? But this is not all. For *Secondly*, *David* was the Person † pitched upon by God himself, and by his immediate Direction anointed to this Purpose: And being so, was now become a publick Person, and so the whole Nation concerned in his Welfare and Safety; And an Attempt to take him off, was therefore an Endeavour to destroy the *publick Happiness*. Which according to Mr. H. was certainly contrary to the Obligations all Princes are under, and was in his Sense a Forfeiture of his Station, and of all the Allegiance that had been due to him. Once more, *Thirdly*, Was *Saul's* Enmity to *David* all his Fault? By no means. For ‖ he had wickedly murder'd near a hundred of the Priests, and their City Nob, both Men and Women, Children and Sucklings, and Oxen, and Asses, and Sheep with the edge of the Sword. And was not this a Destruction of the *publick Welfare*? At least, did this shew *Saul* to have been a terror to evil Works, and a Rewarder of the Good? And did he continually attend upon this very thing? This is no Sign that he did. And yet if he did not, I know not how Mr. H. according to his Principles can maintain, ‡ that he had not lost all his Authority, and so might be lawfully resisted; and by Consequence how he will prove, that *all that can follow from hence, supposing David's Example to oblige our Consciences, is, that it is not lawful for Subjects, to endeavour to dethrone or murder a Prince, for Vices meerly Personal, or on any account of a private Nature.* For this is not all that follows from hence. But supposing *David's Exam-*

* 1 Sam. 15. 23. † 1 Sam. 16. 12, 13. ‖ 1 Sam. 22. 19.
‡ See p. 52. ple

ple obligatory, it follows that it is not lawful to oppose a Prince rejected by God, and an Enemy to good Works, and the publick Happiness. *Which is not agreeable as Mr. H. boasts, but contrary to what he has taught.* But it was what *David* thought, and practis'd, and for which I must take the Liberty to say, notwithstanding what *Mr. H.* has offered to the contrary, our Church has in her Homilies against Rebellion, recommended him as a Pattern for our *Passive* Imitation. And *St. Chrysostom* applauds him to a great Degree for it, declaring that he ascended the Throne with abundantly the greater Glory, when his Time came, because he had behaved himself so patiently and loyally before. ἰδὲ γὰρ ἔτι καὶ τῷ βασιλείαν ἔλαβε, καὶ τῷ χεῖρᾳ ἑκ ἐμύλουεν, &c. * Behold he received the Kingdom with unpolluted Hands; he put on his Crown with an undefiled right hand, he was advanced to the Throne with a Reputation that outshone all the Lustre of the Purple and the Diadem, by reason of his having spared his Enemy, and so mournfully lamented his Fall. For which he was not only honoured during his Life, but his Memory was precious after his Death. And thus he recommends him to the Imitation of all good Christians. † “ Wherefore, O Man, “ if thou desirest either to be lastingly glorious here, or “ eternally happy hereafter, imitate the Vertue of this “ just Man, diligently follow his Example, and let thy “ Carriage shew forth the like Patience with his, that “ having endured the like Conflicts with him, thou mayst “ attain to the same Bliss and Happiness.

But I return to *Mr. H.* who charges some nameless Persons || with condemning *David*, and contradicting the *Homilies*, in Defence of the Cause of Non-resistance; whereas it is evident they need do neither. And for my own Part I profess, I know none that does it, and I am perswaded moreover that none who speak at all to the purpose, can do it; the *Homilies* are so designedly calculated for inculcating the Necessity of this *Passive* Duty. If *Mr. H.* thinks he knows

* Ἐκ τῆς Δαβὶδ καὶ τῆς Σαὺλ. λόγ. β. † Ibid. || P. 29.

any that have done it, he would have done well to have named them, and call'd upon them to vindicate themselves. Which were a much fairer Method of Procedure, than to quarrel with an *Individuum Vagum*, and whom in all probability, upon the strictest enquiry he can make, he will never be able to find.

It is no good sign of Mr. *H*'s being satisfied of the Goodness of his Cause, wherein he has yet so heartily embarked, that he seeks to maintain it by such improper Arguments; producing *David* as a Pattern of Resistance, who was so careful to avoid all Violence to his Prince; and charging his Opponents with contradicting the Homilies of our Church, in a Point wherein it is not easie for them to do it; but himself manifestly does it. As the Reader may easily observe from what follows, out of the Second Homily against Rebellion.

Yet would *David* neither himself slay nor hurt such an Enemy, for that he was his Prince, and Lord; nor would suffer any other to kill, hurt, or lay hand upon him, when he might have been slain without any stir, tumult, or danger of any Man's Life. Now let *David* answer to such demands, as Men desirous of Rebellion do use to make. Shall not we, especially being so good Men as we are, rise, and rebel against a Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy, and therefore like not to prosper either in War or Peace, but to be hurtful and pernicious to the Commonwealth? No, saith God and Godly *David*, God's and such a King's Faithful Subject: And so convicting such Subjects as attempt any Rebellion against such a King, to be neither Good Subjects, nor Good Men. But say they, Shall we not Rise and Rebel against so unkind a Prince, nothing considering, or regarding our True, Faithful, and Painful

Painful Service, or the safeguard of our Posterity? No! saith Good David, whom no Unkindness could cause to forsake his due Obedience to his Sovereign. Shall we not, say they, Rise, and Rebel against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy, that seeketh our Lives? No, saith godly David, who had learned the Lesson that our Saviour afterwards plainly taught, That we should do no hurt to our Fellow Subjects, though they hate us, and are our Enemies; much less unto our Prince, though he were our Enemy. Shall we not assemble an Army of such good Fellows as we are, and by hazarding of our Lives, and the Lives of such as shall withstand us, and withal hazarding the whole estate of our Countrey, remove so naughty a Prince? No, saith godly David; for I when I might without assembling Force, or number of men, without tumult or hazard of any Man's Life, or shedding of any drop of Blood, have delibered my self, and my Country of an evil Prince, yet would I not do it. Are not they (say some) lusty, and courageous Captains, valiant men of Stomach, and good mens Bodies, that do venture by force to kill and depose their King, being a Naughty Prince, and their Mortal Enemy? They may be as lusty and courageous as they list, yet saith Godly David, they can be no Good, or Godly men that so do: For I not only have rebuked, but also Commanded him to be slain as a Wicked Man, which slew King Saul mine Enemy, though he being weary of his Life for the loss of the Victory against his Enemies, desired that Man to slay him. What shall we

G

the

then do to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us, hated of God, hurtful to the Commonwealth? &c. Lay no violent hand upon him, saith good David, but let him live untill God appoint, and work his end, either by Natural Death, or in War by lawful Enemies, not by Traiterous Subjects.

Thus would godly David make answer: And St. Paul, as ye heard before, willeth us also to pray for such a Prince. If King David would make these answers, as by his deeds and words recorded in the Holy Scriptures, indeed he doth make unto all such demands concerning Rebelling against Evil Princes, Unkind Princes, Cruel Princes, Princes that be to their Good Subjects mortal Enemies, Princes that are out of God's Favour, and so hurtful, or like to be hurtful to the Commonwealth: What answer think ye would he make to those that demand, whether they (being naughty and unkind Subjects) may not to the great hazard of the Life of many Thousands, and the utter danger of the State of the Commonwealth, and whole Realm, assemble a sort of Rebels, either to depose, or put in fear, or to destroy their natural and loving Princes? With a great deal more to the same purpose. And if this be on Mr. *H*'s side, it is impossible to tell what is against him, seeing nothing can be more directly so than this is. By which the Reader may please to observe Mr. *H*'s way of arguing; which is to pick out of a Discourse an Expression or two that he thinks he can strain to his purpose, and then lay the whole stress of the Controversie upon that, though in a diametrical opposition to the apparent Design of the whole.

C H A P. IV.

Whether it be not only Innocent, but Honourable and Glorious, to rise up against a Prince, that attends not to the End of his Government?

MR. H's. Fourth Position is this; * *Tho' the Authority of the Prince in carrying forward the End of his Power, cannot be resisted without the highest Guilt; yet his Power in acting contrary to that End, may be opposed without the Shadow of a Crime; nay with Honour and Glory.* This, he tells us afterwards, † *is the principal Doctrine contained in his Sermon, and it plainly appears to be what he chiefly aimed at establishing, that supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society over which they are placed; it is lawful and glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.*

Now Opposition is twofold, either Civil and Legal, or Military and Coactive. It may be such as the Laws of God and Man allow of; I mean an Appeal to the Courts of Judicature, for the deciding of Differences and Redress of Grievances, so long as they are open, and the Subject may have the Benefit of them, and for the Punishment of evil Ministers, under a wilful tyrannical Prince. And would Mr. H. be content with this, I would allow him that it might be Innocent, and in some Cases Honourable. But there is another Sort of Opposition his Mind is set upon, and nothing less than open Violence will serve his Turn, by Force of Arms, or whatever other Course of illegal Resistance. This is what the Word *ἀνίστασθαι* most naturally imports, and what Mr. H. would have thought to be highly justifiable, whenever it is against a bad Governor, and who acts contrary to the *End of his Power.* Here he beats about the Bush, after an unusual rate, and complains of some that allow Resistance in some Cases, but are not willing to own they do; and besides will not allow it *honourable*, nor so

* P. 31. † P. 40.

much as *lawful*. How! Allow it in some Cases? And yet not allow it to be so much as *lawful*? This is somewhat odd. However if there be any such, I leave Mr. *H.* and them, to debate the Matter as they please, amongst themselves. My Business is only with Mr. *H.* who ought to have more substantially proved the *Lawfulness of Resistance*, before he had pretended it to be *Honourable*. And till he does this, I must beg his Pardon, if I believe it to be neither; because there has nothing yet been brought in Evidence for this Doctrine, but what I have shewn to come very short of Proof. If it be either *lawful* or *honourable* to break the Laws of God, and dishonour, perhaps expell and dethrone his Vicegerent, then the Resistance Mr. *H.* pleads for may lay a Claim to both these Epithets. But without such a favourable Concession, he is sadly at a loss, having yet said nothing that will convince an impartial Enquirer of the Lawfulness of it.

There were that pleaded it both *lawful and honourable* to oppose King CHARLES I. of blessed Memory, to raise Forces against him, to pursue him from Place to Place, and at last to seize him, imprison him, and arraign and try him before a pretended High-Court of Justice, a * Court where Reason was not to be hearkned to; and at length to murder him in a most barbarous Manner, beyond the Example of former Ages. A most horrid Fact! that Mr. *H.* professes, at least once every Year, solemnly to bewail and lament, and to implore the Mercy of Almighty God, for the Pardon of it. Yet there were, that would undertake to vindicate this outrageous Wickedness, and to represent it as effected not only *lawfully*, but with *Honour and Glory*. But it was not their vain Boasting, nor is it Mr. *H.*'s in any other like Case, that will alter the Nature of Things, and make what is really heinous, and a crying Sin, to become no Sin at all; nay to commence virtuous and laudable. To be a Rebel or a Traitor, may be a Sign of Courage, and Resentment, but not of a meek and humble Spirit, or the tru-

* K. Shew me the Court where Reason is not to be heard, Bradshaw. Sir, we will shew it you here. Works of King Charles the Martyr, Edit. 1662. p. 434. K. Shew me that Jurisdiction where Reason is not to be heard. Bradshaw. 1y
 sr. We shew it you here, The Commons of England. Philips's Journal of y^e Court for y^e Trial of K. Cha. 1. published by Dr. Nelson, p. 45, 46.

ly patient and lowly Temper and Genius of Christianity; which is highly honourable and glorious, and the contrary whereto can upon no Terms be so.

Our Saviour would not so much as permit his Disciples St. *James* and St. *John* to call for Fire from Heaven, after the Example of *Elias*, upon a Village of the *Samaritans*, that would not receive him as he was going up to *Jerusalem*, but * *turned and rebuked them, and said, ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of. You would do well to consider, how opposite this exterminating Spirit is to the Design of my Coming*; as the Learned Dr. *Whitby* paraphrases upon the Words. And is it imaginable, that he will ever approve of the like furious Zeal against the *Higher Powers*? Or that according to his Doctrine of Patience and Submission, it can possibly be reputable, or indeed any way justifiable for others of his Followers, to rise up against their Sovereign, not for their Saviour's, but for their own Sake, and only for Fear of some temporal Mischief that might probably attend their Quiet and dutiful Submission, after his Example, and in Obedience to his Command? To transgress his Laws, for the Sake of any Worldly Advantage, can never be Matter of true Honour and Glory, whatsoever Pretences witty Men may frame for the doing of it. And Mr. *H.* may therefore have as much of this Honour as he can desire, without the Danger of being envied for it, by any who prefer the Salvation of their immortal Souls before the good Things of this short transitory Life. For my own Part, I cannot but think it incomparably greater Glory, to follow our blessed Saviour, *who was made perfect thro' Sufferings*, and that truly Christian Company of Martyrs and Confessors, who so manfully underwent the most barbarous Indignities and Tortures, and who, not by Resistance of their lawful Superiours, but † *thro' Faith and Patience inherited the Promises*.

For I am entirely of Arch-bishop *Usher's* Opinion, that *God's Word is clear in the Point*. Whosoever resisteth, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation;

* Luke 9. 55. Heb. 6. 12. || *Power of the Prince*, p. 157.
and

and thereby a Necessity is imposed upon us of being subject, even for Conscience Sake ; which may not be avoided by the Pretext of any ensuing Mischief whatsoever. For by this means we should have Liberty given unto us, to speak Evil of the Law, and to judge the Law. But if thou judge the Law, thou art not a Doer of the Law, but a Judge, saith St. James. It becomes us in Obedience to perform our Part ; and leave the Ordering of Events to God, whose Part only that is.

C H A P. V.

Whether the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind be the sole End of Government ?

I Am now come to Mr. H's. Fifth Position, * that *the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind is the sole End of Government*, as well if it be appointed by God himself, as if it be purely of humane Institution ; and again in other Terms, † *Submission is due to Governors, not for their own Sake, but meerly for the Sake of Publick Happiness*. Here I design these two things. 1. To prove that *the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind is not the sole End of Government*. And 2. To shew that if it were so, yet this would not answer Mr. H's. Design of proving the Lawfulness of resisting the higher Powers.

1. I begin with the former of these, to prove that *the publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind is not the sole End of Government* ; as Mr. H. supposes, when he tells us, *Submission is due to Governors, not for their own sake, but meerly for the sake of publick Happiness*. Where I must observe, Mr. H. has not rightly enumerated the Ends of Submission to Governors. He takes Notice of two only, Themselves, and the Happiness of their Subjects. Whereas, if he had pleased, he might have mentioned a Third of much weightier Consideration than either of these, that is, their being *God's Ordinance*. But this he well knew was not for his Purpose, and therefore he thought it more convenient to drop it quite, than to start a Difficulty that was not to be got over. This one would think were a pretty bold At-

* P. 32. † *Ibid*.

tempt

tempt in a Case wherein the Apostle is so exprefs to the contrary. But this is a small Matter with Mr. *H.* for he tells us roundly in the next Words, that the Apostle uses no ſuch Argument for enforcing our Obedience. *As for St. Paul, whom I was to follow, he uſeth no other Argument to prove, either that Governors are of God, or that Submission is due to them in Point of Conſcience, but the Uſefulneſs of their Office to humane Societies.* Strange! that a Man can thus poſitively contradict the exprefs Words of the Holy Scripture. *The Powers that be, ſays the Apoſtle,* are ordained of God; whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation; and again,† Ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, or fear of Punishment from the Magiſtrate, but alſo for Conſcience ſake, and out of Obedience to God Almighty who has required it.* Can any thing be more plain than this? *St. Paul uſeth no other Argument to prove, ſays Mr. H. that Submission is due to Governors in point of Conſcience, but the Uſefulneſs of their Office to humane Societies.* What can be more different from the Apoſtle? If this be to follow *St. Paul*, as he profeſſes he was to do, he would do well when he writes again, to let us know what it is to contradict him.

Befides, it is the Apoſtle's Aſſertion, || that *there are no Powers but of God*; yet Mr. *H.* ſpeaks here of ſuch, as are purely of humane Inſtitution.‡ And yet he would be thought to follow *St. Paul* ſtill.

However, * *St. Peter*, 1 Epift. 2. 13. expreſſly calls the King, and Governors under him, by the Name of an humane Ordinance. Very true! This Apoſtle calls the Magiſtrate *ἀνθρώπου κτίσις*, a humane Creature, or Creation. Not, ſays * *Beza*, becauſe it is invented by Men. And hereto very nearly agree the *Assembly-Annotators*, whoſe Words I ſhall take the Liberty to tranſcribe, becauſe it is not improbable they may weigh more with ſome Men, than any other Sort of Paraphraſts. Tho' the Generality of Commentators ſpeak likewiſe to the ſame purpoſe. † *By Ordinance*, ſay they,

* *Rom.* 13. 2. † *V.* 5. || *V.* 1. ‡ *P.* 3. * *In loc.* † *Ibid.*

is meant the framing and ordering of Civil Government, called the Ordinance of Man, not because it is invented by, or hath its original from man; (for all Power is from God, Rom. 13. 1. 2. tho' sometimes he useth Men as Means, to derive Power or Government to such a Person or Persons, that so they may be the more willing to yield Obedience;) but because it is proper to Men, or because it is discharged by Men. Here, I confess, they put the Adjunct for the Subject, the Office for him in whom it resides, and speak only of the Institution of Government, whereas the Apostle refers plainly to the Governor, whether he be the King or Emperor, or some other subordinate Magistrate; for so are his Words, *whether to the King as supreme, or unto Governors, Deputies and Lieutenants, Proconsuls, or Procurators, &c.* who were sent to bear Rule in distant Countries, where the Emperor could not be present to do it in his own Person. But yet they interpret the Words to such a Sense, as shews^a apparently whence they concluded all Authority to be derived. And Archbishop Usher has observed * of David Paraus, that (altho' otherwise no very great Friend to the supreme Power of Kings) yet he putteth us here in mind, that the Word *κρίσις*, used in the Text, doth lead us to the Consideration of God the prime Author of Magistracy: For the Magistrates (thus the Words run) are said to be created, that is, ordained by Men, yet their first Creator properly is God alone, unto whom only all Creation doth properly appertain. But Mr. H. it seems knew better. He has at length found out that Government may be of purely humane Institution; as if Governors derived their Authority only from a Compact and Stipulation with their People. A Doctrine † he will never be able to maintain to the Satisfaction of any who are not willing to take a confident Assertion for a convincing Argument. But this only by the Way.

* *Power of the Prince*, part 1. Sect. VI. † See Bp. Sander-
son's Preface to A. B. Usher's *Power of the Prince*, Sect. XV,
XVI, XVII, XVIII.

What I am chiefly to observe in this place is, that Mr. H. makes the *Public Peace and Happiness of Mankind the sole End of Government*. And he is so full of this Persuasion, that he cannot but wonder it should appear strange to any that can read it. Now I must confess I can, and have read it, and am not a little surprized at his Admiration, in a case where he is so palpably in the Wrong. That this is a very weighty *End of Government* is readily granted him; but such an acknowledgment is far from an Owning that it is *the sole End* of it. There may be other Ends no less considerable, and that may call for the People's Subjection at least as much as this. And I could mention a late much greater Man than Mr. H. I mean the truly Learned and Devout Bishop * *Beveridge*, who sticks not to affirm, that the Prince
is

* *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, the great and glorious Monarch of all the World, having enacted many gracious Laws, is pleased to set over every Kingdom and Nation, such Persons as may put them in Execution. So that I cannot but look upon a lawful King as truly a Representative of the most high G O D, as a Parliament of the People; and am therefore persuaded, that whosoever rebels against Him, rebels against G O D himself; not only in that he rebels against the Ordinance of G O D, and so against the G O D of that Ordinance; but because he rebels against him whom G O D hath set up as his Vicegerent, to represent his Person, and execute his Laws, in such a Part of his Dominions.*

Hence it is that these two Precepts, Fear G O D, and Honour the King, are so often join'd together in Holy Writ; for he that fears G O D's Power, cannot but honour his Authority; and he that honours not the King that Represents G O D, cannot be said to fear G O D who is represented by Him. And hence likewise it is, that G O D hath been as strict and express in enjoining us Obedience to our Governors, as to Himself: For thus saith the Lord of Hosts, Rom. 13. 1. Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers. Why? Because there is no Power but of G O D, and the Powers that be, are ordained of God.

is set up as a *Representative of the most High*, and that Submission is necessarily to be paid him upon this account: There is also another late Eminent Writer, and whom Mr. H. is ready enough to quote as of good Authority, when he thinks it may be for his purpose, the
Judici-

And he has denounced as great a Judgment against such as rebell against the Magistrate He hath ordained, as against those that rebell against Himself; For whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation, v. 2. So that the Wrath of GOD shall as certainly fall upon those that rise up against the King, as upon those that fight against GOD. And no wonder that the Punishment should be the same, when the Fault is the same: For he that fights against his King, fights against GOD Himself, who hath invested him with that Power and Authority to govern his People, representing His own Glorious Majesty before them.

Upon this Ground it is that I believe, the Wickedness of a Prince cannot be a sufficient Plea for the Disobedience of his Subjects; for it is not the Holiness, but the Authority of God that he represents, which the most Wicked, as well as the most Holy Person may be endowed with. And therefore when the Gospel first began to spread it self over the Earth, tho' there was no Christian King or Supream Magistrate of what Title soever, to cherish and protect it; nay, tho' the civil Powers were then the greatest Enemies to it; yet, even then, were the Disciples of CHRIST enjoined, to submit themselves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake.

Insomuch that did I live amongst the Turks, I should look upon it as my Duty to obey the Grand Seigneur, in all his lawful Edicts, as well as the most Christian and Pious King in the World. For suppose a Prince be never so wicked, and never so negligent in his Duty of protecting me; it doth not follow that I must neglect mine of obeying Him. In such a case I have another Duty added to this; and that is, to pray for him, and to intercede with GOD for his Conversion: For thus hath the King of Kings commanded, that Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made, as for all Men, so more especially for Kings, and those that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life in all Godliness and Honesty. 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. So that whensoever I address to the Court of Heaven, I must be sure to remember my Sovereign on Earth, that GOD would be pleased to enable his servant to reign on Earth, as Himself doth in Heaven, in Righteousness and

Judicious and Learned Dr. *Falkner*, who * in like manner assigns this as a principal cause of the Subjection required of Governors, that it may keep up in our Minds, a Sense of our Duty to God himself, under whom, and by whose Authority they Govern, and whose Deputies and Vicegerents they are; so says S. *Chrysostom* too; † *that the Christians may not complain they are vilified and made contemptible, whilst being Heirs of the Kingdom that is above, they are nevertheless subjected by the Apostle to these earthly Governors, the Apostle, says he, shews them that in doing this, he does not so much subject them to their temporal Princes, as to the most High God. For it is he that is obeyed by Submission to Governors.*

But I chuse rather to put Mr. *H.* in mind that S. *Peter* || requires subjection to them *ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ*, for the Lord's sake. Which words shew another Reason for our Obedience, and that it is not owing meerly for the sake of Publick Happiness. And upon this account I take it

and Mercy. But especially in case of any seeming, or real Default, or Defect, tho' I do not think it a Subject's Duty to judge or censure his Sovereign's Actions, I am to be the more earnest in my Prayers and Intercessions for him; but upon no account to fight, or rebell against him. Bishop *Beveridge's* Private Thoughts, &c. concerning Relations, Ref. 1. P. 247, &c.

* Though the good of the People be a great End of Government, yet is it not the sole end thereof. But as when a Prince appointeth a Chief Officer of a Corporation, this is not only for the benefit of the members of that Society; but it is also intended, that they may be more useful to do the King service, and that the Commonwealth may receive benefit thereby: so in a Sovereignty, there is a claim of God's Authority in the World, for his honour; and therefore out of Conscience, and duty to God, there must be a Subjection shewed to Rulers as his Ministers, besides what the interest of the community will require. Christian Loyalty. B. 2. C. 2. Sect. 4 p. 403, 404.

† ἵνα ᾧ μὴ λέγωσιν οἱ πρὸς. ὅτι ἐξουτελίζεις ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐνχα-
ταρονήτες ποιεῖς, τὰς τῷ ᾧ ἐξουτὸν βασιλείας καταλαύειν
μέλλοντας ἀρχισιν ὑποτάξων, δείκνυσιν ὅτι ἐκ ἀρχισιν, ἀλλὰ
τῷ Θεῷ πάλιν ὑποτάξαι τὰ πρὸς πρὸς. Ἐκεῖνον ᾧ ὁ ταῖς ἀρ-
χῶν ὑποτασσόμεθα πείθεσθαι. B. *Chrysost.* in Rom. 13. 2.

|| 1 S. Pet. 2. 13.

to be that their Throne is called * the Throne of the Lord, and they are said to be † Gods in Scripture, and the *Children of the most High*, as being such by Office and Deputation, and designed to represent God the Supreme Lord and King, and to rule under, as well as for him. And so Resisting them must be as much a Resisting him whose Deputies and Vicegerents they are, as an Affront put upon an Ambassador, is put also upon his Master, whose Character he bears, and upon whose Message he is sent.

And the same truth is taught in like manner by St. Paul, in the Words of Mr. H's. Text, howsoever he has made a shift to find out a contrary Sense for them. For here the Apostle enjoins that *every Soul, i. e. every Person, High and Low, Rich and Poor, Honourable and Dishonourable, be subject to the Higher Powers*; and gives this Reason of his Injunction, because the Powers are the *Ordinance of God*, and so resisting them is resisting God who has ordained them; and must unavoidably be of very dangerous Consequence, in as much as *whosoever thus resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation*. Whence it is undeniable, that this Apostle did not resolve all the Obligation of Subjects to submit to their Superiours, into Mr. H's. *sole end of their Institution*; (tho' by how much the more diligent Superiours are in acting agreeably to that end, so much the greater encouragement have their Inferiours for Submission to them, as the Apostle intimates) he does not, I say, resolve all the Obligation of Subjects to their Superiours into his End of their Institution, but places it chiefly upon the Institution it self, the neglect of which is an Affront to Almighty God, by whose Authority they bear Rule.

And another great End of their Institution, or at least a principal Part of that now mentioned, is a Care of God's Worship and Service, and an Endeavour to

* 1 Chron. 29. 23.

† Psal. 82. 6. and S. John 10. 34.

dispose their Subjects for a better State, against they shall be taken hence. Which though it be a likely means of bringing down God's Blessings upon the Places where duly put in Practice, and so is a great Promoter of the *Publick Happiness of Society*, yet 'tis so only consequentially, and the main Aim of it is another sort of Happiness than what can be attained to in this World. And this is what all Rulers have ever thought a principal part of their Office, though many times to very ill purpose; as *Jeroboam* did in setting up his *Calves* * at *Dan* and *Bethel*; and *Nebuchadnezzar* † in commanding the Worship of the *Golden Image*. On the other hand *David* || took care of the Worship of the true God, appointed * the *Levites* their Courses, and † their Duty, || ordered their Psalms, and * set himself to discountenance Vice and Immorality. *Jehn* † destroyed the Worshipers of *Baal*; *Asa* || destroyed the *Sodomites* and the *Idols*; *Jehosaphat* * took away the high places and groves out of *Israel*, and † commanded the Law of his God to be taught in all the Cities of *Judah*; and *Hezekiah* || proclaimed a Passover, and * exhorted the People to return to the Lord God of their Fathers and serve and Worship him, and † appointed the Courses of the Priests and the Levites, every Man according to his service, the Priests and the Levites for burnt-offerings, and for peace-offerings, to Minister, and to give thanks, and to praise in the gates of the tents of the Lord. These things have a Higher tendency, than the Welfare and Happiness of the Publick, as much as Eternal Glory is above all earthly Comforts and Advantages. And yet being a great part of the Magistrates Office, I cannot believe, but when Mr. *H.* reflects upon it, he will readily acknowledge, that the *Publick Peace and Happiness of*

* 1 Kings, 12. 28, 29. † Dan. 3. 1, &c. || 1 Chron. 16. 4, &c. * Ch. 23. 6. † V. 28, &c. || See the Titles of them. * Psal. 101. 3, &c. † 2 Kings 10. 28. || 1 King 15. 12. * 2 Chron. 17. 6. † V. 7, 8, 9. || 2 Chron. 30. 1, &c. * V. 6, 7, 8. † Ch. 31. 2.

Mankind, which as it is *Publick* and relates to Society, must necessarily be in this World, is not the *sole end of Government*.

2. And yet if I should grant Mr. *H.* his Position, though there is no reason for doing it, if I should grant him, I say, that *the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind were the sole End of Government*, I am not sensible that this would be of any Service to his Doctrine of Resistance; for these two reasons, 1. All that could fairly be inferred from hence is no more than that God Almighty must therefore have allowed the Subject all that Liberty which is necessary for promoting this good Design, so highly beneficial to Mankind; and therefore when he has forbidden all Resistance, as he has certainly done in the 2d Verse, if words can do it, he did it to prevent the much greater Mischiefs that would accrue to Societies from Rebellion, than from Tyranny. I presume I have as much right to argue upon Inferences as Mr. *H.* And if his whole Discourse be built upon a Wrong Inference, I may be allowed to oppose him upon a Right one. He first concludes the *Happiness of Society to be the sole End of Government*, and that Resistance is in divers Cases the best way of preserving this Happiness, and then that the Apostle must have allowed it. On the other hand I have shewn that the All-wise God who best knows what will answer his own End, hath expressly forbidden all Resistance; which upon Mr. *H.*'s Supposition of the *Happiness of Society being the sole End of Government*, must necessarily imply that Resistance is therefore more Destructive of this Happiness than Submission, in as much as otherwise it would never have been forbidden at all, and especially not with this terrible commination, of Damnation to those who venture upon it. Wherefore were I in Mr. *H.*'s place, I would much sooner distrust my own Judgment, and suspect I might possibly be mistaken; and that neither Submission might be so detrimental, nor Resistance so useful to Society as I had imagined, than contrary to the plain Words of my Text, and the universal Belief and Practice of the Christian Church through

through all the first Ages of it, pretend to magnific Resistance, as the only Means of promoting the main End of Government. I should rather be inclined to think that I might be out in my Notions of Resistance, and that the Consequences of it might be different from what I had hitherto persuaded my self, than that God would make *the Happiness of Society the sole End of Government*, and yet at the same time condemn not only the best in my conception, but the only Method that could effectually answer that End.

God Almighty can bring his own Ends about without our Assistance: And it is but a vain thing to imagine that a Church or Nation must unavoidably be ruined, if they do not follow the dictates of humane Wisdom for their own Preservation, though in direct Opposition to the Words of Scripture. * *There is no restraint to the Lord, but he can equally save by many or by few, can cause † one to chase a thousand, and two to put ten thousand to flight, || can defeat the Counsel of the most subtle Achitophel, and turn it into foolishness, * nor is there any Wisdom, or Understanding, nor Counsel against him.* And there is no need therefore that a People betake themselves to Arms for their Security against their Sovereign's Encroachments, or whatsoever ill usage of them; it being a much safer course, by patient suffering to commit themselves and all their Concerns into God's hands, and leave the Event with him. And that Almighty God has thought fit to prescribe this method, rather than that of Resistance, is to me a full indication, that such a patient Submission will at the long run prove more advantageous to his Church and People, than any Opposition they can make against their lawful Governours. And by consequence, if we should suppose the People's Happiness and Safety to be the *sole End of Government*, even this Supposition would plead for a quiet Non-resistance as the properest means of a

* 1 Sam. 14. 6. † Deut. 32. 30. || 2 Sam. 15. 31.
* Prov. 21. 30.

Nation's Security, with all that dare rely upon God's good Providence and Protection.

2. The Welfare and Good of the Society is not what Mr. *H.* takes it to be. For he makes it to respect the Subjects only, whereas a Society includes the Head as well as the other Members. And the Welfare and Happiness of the Society, is the Welfare and Happiness of the Whole, not of one part without the other. The Peace and Welfare of a College does not mean of the Fellows and Scholars only, without the Master, who is the Head and Principal Part of it. Nor by a Corporation can we properly understand the Aldermen, Common-Council, and Burgeſſes, without their Head the Mayor. So neither does a City-Company exclude the Master, nor an Army its General, nor a Family the Parent or Master of it. Nor is there any manner of Reason, why a King should not be looked upon as a Member, whilst he is the chief and principal Member, the Head of his Kingdom. And his Interest therefore and Welfare ought to be taken into that of the Community, it being impossible the whole Kingdom should be Sound and Healthy, whilst its Head is Sick. And so the learned and judicious Bishop *Sanderſon* determines the *Safety* of the *People*, * to be that of the *whole Community, of the King together with his Subjects*; who can never be truly safe and happy, unless He be so too. And so ſays a later Writer of great worth †, *What is that Publick whereof you ſo frequently ſpeak? Is*

* *Salutem Populi*, id eſt, totius *Communitatis*, ut ea vox *Regem* unà cum *ſubditis* complectitur, *ſupremam Legem* eſſe, nemo ſanæ mentis negaverit; at *ſalutem populi*, id eſt, *ſubditorum*, excluſo Rege, *ſupremam eſſe Legem* quis dixerit niſi aut *ſatuuſ*, aut *Impoſtor*? *Eatuuſ*, ſi ipſi ſibi ſic dicenti fidem habeat; ſi non habeat, *Impoſtor*. De Obligat. Conſcient. Præleſt. 9. Sect. 16.

† The Plea of Publick Good not ſufficient to juſtifie the taking up Arms, againſt our Rightful and Lawful Sovereigns.

it not that *whereof Kings are the Head?* Whence he infers, *the Good of the Publick must be Their Good and Our Good in conjunction.* A plain and rational Assertion, and that one would think needed no proof, nor were to be contradicted by any that does but in the least consider it. And yet Mr. H. has found out a very cunning Answer for it, in these Words.

1. * *If the Publick be that whereof Kings are the Head, then the Good of the Publick is the Good of that whereof Kings are the Head, that is the Good of the Body, not of the Head, unless this Author will make Kings the Head of the Head, as well as of the Body.* This is a notable Discovery; and such as I dare say, no Man would have hit upon but Mr. H. The Body is that whereof the chief Part is the Head, therefore it is the Trunk without the Head. Let Mr. H. make any thing better of his Argument than this, if he can; for my part I cannot. And I much doubt, if his Head were once severed from the rest of his Body, that they would both be but in an ill condition. Surely this was designed only to shew his Wit, and divert his Readers. For he must have a very mean opinion of their Understanding, if he could imagine such trifling to pass with them for Argument. Suppose I should say, *The Good of the Publick is the Good of that whereof the Populace are the Feet,* would it any way follow from hence, that it were the good of the rest of the Community, but not of the Populace, *unless we will make the Populace the Feet of the Feet, as well as of the Body?* I am apt to think Mr. H. himself will not say this. And yet it is an Inference exactly parallel to his own. Besides,

2. He has a second Answer not a jot better than the former, namely, that *supposing that Kings are the Head of the Publick (tho' he should think that King, Lords, and Commons are more properly the Head of the Pub-*

* Pref. to his 2d Edition. p. vi.

lick in which we are concerned;) it is not at all just to argue from the Metaphorical use of the Words Body, and Head: as if because the Natural Body cannot subsist without that particular Head to which it is once joined; therefore the Body Politick cannot possibly be benefitted without unviolated regard to one particular Person who hath once been the Head of it. No one can deny but that Usurpers may be the Heads of the Body Politick; as the Cæsars were at first: Yet I dare say, this Author will allow that the Body may seek their own Good as distinct from that of Usurpers. A General of an Army is the Head of that Body; yet may that Head be in many Cases changed to the great Advantage of that Body, &c. And a little after, That the Good of the Publick (called the Body Politick only in a Figurative Sense) is not so tied to one particular Head, is evident from the Death of some, and the Succession of other Heads to the same Rule over the same Body Politick. Here is such a series of Argumentation as I should not have expected from one of Mr. H's. Character and Ingenuity; and which I can impute to nothing but the badness of his Cause that would not admit of better.

First, He cannot think Kings to be the Head of the Body Politick. Though if he look into the Statute-Book, he will find it plainly taught; if into Mr. *Sheringham's Remonstrance of the King's Right*, and Dr. *Hickes's Jovian*, he will see it proved: if into all the Addresses made to the Queen, by Either or Both of the Houses of Parliament, he cannot fail of observing that they constantly stile themselves *Her Majesty's most Dutiful and Loyal Subjects*; if into the Oath of Supremacy always taken from the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign till the Revolution, that will teach him that the King, or Queen was all that time acknowledged to be the only supreme Governour of this Realm. And if this be not the Head of the Community, Mr. H. may please at his leisure, (not to think, but to prove) that all assertions of this nature, whether in the Statute-Book, or wheresoever else, are meer impositions and signifie nothing at all. He may also consider farther,

what

what a delicate half-headed Body this Nation must be, whenever there is no Parliament sitting and especially when none in Being.

Secondly, Mr. *H.* will not allow it *just* to argue from the Metaphorical use of the Words Body and Head. But if he will not, he ought to make us a new Rhetorick, and teach us a new way of speaking, different from that of our Forefathers, who have always made use of Metaphors, as of great benefit for illustrating the truth, when not misapplied, nor pursued too far; *Aristotle* * affirms them to be highly useful both in Poetry and Prose. And so says *Vossius*, † *Nullus est florentior tropus, &c. There is no Trope more beautiful, and which adds more light to what is spoken, than a Metaphor.* And Mr. *H.* can shew no cause, why it may not be as reasonably used, and as pertinently, in the present case as in any other. I am confident he will find none wherein it is more common, even amongst the best Writers.

And yet if we comply so far with him, as to lay aside this manner of expression, I can foresee no advantage he will get by it. For he will find it no less difficult a Task to prove the King to be no Part of the Society or Community, nor any way interested in its Welfare and Happiness, than to prove that the Happiness of the whole Body does not imply that of the Head, as much at least, as of any of the other Members; in truth a great deal more.

Thirdly, Mr. *H.* thinks it strange, that because the Natural Body cannot subsist without that particular Head to which it was once joined, it should hence be thought that the Body Politick cannot possibly be benefited without unviolated regard to one particular Person, who has

* Καὶ ὅτι τὸ πλεῖστον δύνανται, καὶ ἐν ποιήσει καὶ ἐν λόγοις, αἱ μεταφοραὶ, εἰρηται, καὶ ἀπὸ ἐλέγχου ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς. De Rhetor. l. 3. c. 2. p. 181. τὸ μὲν ἐν μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιεῖται, μὴ δὲ ταπεινὸν ἢ γλῶττα, καὶ ἡ μεταφορὰ, &c. De Poeticâ, c. 22.

† De Rhetor. l. 4. c. 4.

once been the *Head* of it. And he may think so as long as he pleases, without any Body to contradict him that I know of. These Words *who has once been the Head of it*, argue themselves not to relate to any one who is so; and then Mr. *H.* would do well to tell us, who ever stood up for an unviolated Regard to one who was not at that time the Head of the Community. When the Emperour ~~Henry~~^{Charles} Vth. resigned his Dominions, did any ever think they were still bound to pay their Allegiance to Him, and not rather to his Brother and Successor *Ferdinand* the First? Nor do the *Dutch* think themselves any longer obliged to those of their States-General, when once the time for which they were chosen is expired, unless they be chosen again. So that it is not a Person's having been once Head of a People that requires *an unviolated regard* to Him. And if this were all Mr. *H.* argues against, I presume none would oppose him in it: I am sure I would not. But this is not his Case; the Design of both his Sermon and its Vindication was to encourage the Resistance of whatsoever present Sovereign, that does not act up to the Ends of his Station. And instead of pursuing his Point, to talk of one who has been, and is not the Head to whom this Regard is due, is only to amuse his Readers with something he knows to be not at all to the purpose.

Fourthly, Mr. *H.* lays it down as an unquestionable Truth, that Usurpation entitles to the Headship of the Community: * *No Man can deny*, says he, *but Usurpers may be the Heads of the Body Politick.* Which would sound oddly from any one who in the least pretends to understand the nature of our Constitution; but it does so more especially from Mr. *H.* who but a few Lines before would not allow a lawful King alone to be the Head, when the Laws plainly teach he is. Yet as shy as Mr. *H.* is in relation to the Headship of a Rightful Sovereign, he suffers *no Man* to doubt whe-

* Pref. P. vii.

ther an Usurper has a Right to it. So that according to him, the two *Cromwell's* were better Heads of our *Body Politick* than any that have reigned since. And if he be of this Opinion, no wonder that he shews himself so Zealous for the Doctrine of Resistance of lawful Princes. Though whether of Usurpers I cannot say; for though he is well assured, † the Author he writes against *will allow that the Body may seek their own Good, as distinct from that of Usurpers*, he does not vouchsafe to acquaint us with his own Sentiments in the case, and whether he admits of resisting such or not.

Fifthly, What follows next, is as trifling as any thing he has said in all this loose and indigested Period. *A General of an Army is the Head of that Body, yet may that Head be in many Cases changed to the great advantage of that Body.* The Question under debate was whether the King, or Queen, be the Head of the Kingdom, and their Good included in that of the whole. And the Answer is, *a General of an Army may be changed, and sometimes to great Advantage.* Mr. H. may call this arguing, if he pleases. His other instance of a *Master of a Family* is as impertinent, but not so practicable as this; in as much as a Sovereign has just Power to change the General of his Forces, but the Servants of a Family have not a Right to turn out their Master.

Sixthly, He has one Consideration more under this Head, but still of the same strain with the others. *The Interest of the Body Politick, says Mr. H. is not tied to one particular Head; and this he tells us is evident from the Death of some, and the Succession of other Heads to the same Rule over the same Body Politick.* Does Mr. H. take this to prove that the Good of the Prince is not to be taken in conjunction with that of the Subjects, to make up the Good of the Publick? If he does not, he knows it is nothing to the purpose; and if he does, I must confess he has a peculiar way of thinking.

† *Ibid.*

For may not the Good of the Prince be always a part of the Publick Good, and a principal part of it too, unless the Prince were immortal? It is true, when a Prince dies, his Good is no farther included in that of his People; but then the Heir's is, who hereupon commences immediately the Prince, and is to all intents and purposes the Head of the Community as much as his Predecessor was. And so from Generation to Generation. It being a constant Maxim in Law, that *the King never dies*, the Nation can never be without a Head, so long as there is any remaining to Inherit the Throne. And though it be not the same King, or Queen, yet so long as there is a Rightful King or Queen in being, there is as much a Head whose Interest is to be considered in relation to the Good of the Kingdom, as if it were still the same individual Person.

Besides, I would desire Mr. H. to reflect, whether this way of arguing would not make much more against, than for him; and whether it would not much rather prove that the Good of the People ought not to be attended to, than that of the Sovereign. Because the People are in a more continual flux than the Prince. The Prince dies now, and then, as other particular Persons do. But the People are every Hour coming into and going out of the World, and never continue the same for any time. So that if the Change of Persons exclude from an interest in that of the Publick, it must do it chiefly where the greatest Change is, that is, amongst the Subjects, vast Multitudes of whom Die, in the Reign of one single Prince.

Thus I have fully considered Mr. H's. second Answer to that Question, Whether the *Publick* be not that whereof *Kings* are the Head? I now leave it, and proceed to the truest Assertion I have met with in him for a great while; which is that

3. *The true Interest of Kings can never be separated from the true Interest of the Publick of which they are the Head.* Very right! and agreeable enough to the Sentiments of the Author Mr. H. is endeavouring to confute! But how then does Mr. H. bring himself off

off here? He gives this reason of his Assertion: *As long as they are at the Head, it is their chief and great Interest to promote the Publick Good.* An Assertion no less true than the former! But then on the other hand, it is no less the Subjects Interest to promote the Publick Good, that is, of both their Sovereign and themselves, than it is the Prince's. Well, but suppose the Prince instead of promoting the Publick Interest sets himself to ruine it. And suppose on the contrary that he is falsely charged with doing this when he does it not; how terrible may be the consequences of such a Suggestion, though ever so groundless? Suppose again that the Charge be just, and that the King do really seek the damage and hurt of his People; in this case he does very ill. But this is no reason why they should behave themselves undutifully and unjustly towards him, or should bring a far greater mischief upon themselves by rising up against him, than they were like to have suffered from his Male-administration. Yet this is a common effect of Rebellion; which is always pretended to be, as * *Abalom* insinuated of his, for the Publick Benefit; but usually proves a Remedy incomparably worse than the Disease, an Evil much more dreadful, than what was to have been prevented or removed by it. Here Mr. H. resumes his former contrivance of making the Publick a headless Body, because Kings are the Heads of it; in as much as being so, (in some sort, though he *thinks not properly*) the Publick with him is only the Body without the Head, the Subjects only without the Sovereign. He disputes also against assisting the King *in seeking an imaginary good of his own, and that tends to the Ruine of his Subjects.* Which might as well have been forborn; and no doubt would, if he had bethought himself that the Author he writes against, never speaks of any such mistaken or *imaginary Good*, but the real Benefit and Safety of the Prince. And this real Good therefore Mr. H. ought to have

¹ * 2 Sam. 15. 3, 4, 5, 6.

shewn not to be the concern of the Publick; and not to have run off to a false *imaginary* Good, which this Controversie has nothing to do with. He asks likewise, *If the Good (that is, the Temporal Grandeur) of the Head must never be disregarded, why must the Publick Good, the Good of the Body be trampled upon?* In which Question, he first makes the *Publick Good*, to be the Good of the Body without the Head; which I have before observed, is a meer quibble, and has not so much as the face of an Argument. And secondly he supposes the Gentleman he writes against to be for trampling upon the Good of the Body; though he cannot find one word in him to that purpose, but on the contrary he was for endeavouring the Good of the *Publick*, that is, both of the Head and the rest of the Body, by all honest and lawful means; only he would not have any used but what are so. All Mr. *H.* can charge upon him is, that he was rather for submitting to God's Will, and depending upon his Providence, and observing his Commands; than for seeking after the *Temporal Grandeur* of himself or his Fellow-Subjects by any kind of Sin. And if Mr. *H.* will call this *trampling upon the Good of the Publick*, there is no help for it. But then let him speak out, let him openly declare whether he thinks the Subjects can in any case defend themselves better without God, than he can do it without them; and again, whether that Preservation is worth the having, which is not to be had without departing from their Duty both to God and their Sovereign.

4. Mr. *H.* declares concerning *Publick Good*, that either it is in every Case the same with what this Author calls the Good of the King, or it is not. If it be, then, says he, *my Doctrine is as much against Resistance in any Case, as His can be.* If it be not, then may it be consider'd and regarded as something, in some Cases, distinct from it. I suppose Mr. *H.* has a meaning in what he says here, tho' I am not yet so happy as to comprehend it. The Words he undertakes to descant upon, are, that *the Good of the Publick must be their [the Sovereigns] Good, and our Good in Con-*
junction

junction. And this Mr *H.* takes upon him to disprove; but whether what is here recited be any disproof of it, I must leave to the impartial Reader to judge, who perhaps may understand the force of it, better than I do.

5. Mr. *H.* argues from the Subjects Right, to sue in Civil Courts for the Maintenance or Recovery of their own just Rights, tho' it be against the King. *This, says he, is not seeking their own Good in conjunction with the King's.* Where I must beg his Pardon, if I cannot concur in Opinion with him: For it is only seeking our own Good in such a way, as the Laws both of God and the Land allow of; such a way as not only does not tend to expel and dethrone the King, but does not aim at divesting him of any the least Right that belongs to him, and can justly be claim'd by him. And this I take to be *seeking our own Good in conjunction with our Sovereign's.* And I challenge Mr. *H.* to disprove it, if he can, by shewing that to stick to the Rules and Laws of the Constitution, and pay the Sovereign such Allegiance as these prescribe, is not for the Good of the Head. It tends very much to the Good of the Head, to have all its Laws duly observ'd, and to live quietly in the Possession of all its own Rights, tho' the Subjects do not surrender up theirs, but claim and insist upon them, so long as they can be allow'd to do it in a Legal way. Nor is this Method of Proceeding any way inconsistent with a Promise, * *To bear Faith and true Allegiance to the Queen's Highness, Her Heirs and Lawful Successors, and to assist and defend all Jurisdictions, Privileges, Preeminencies and Authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, Her Heirs and Successors, or annex to the imperial Crown of this Realm.* To which Mr. *H.*'s Doctrine of Resistance is directly opposite.

* *As Queen Elizabeth required the Subjects to Swear, in the Oath of Supremacy impos'd, Eliz. 1. ch. 1. 19. and An. 5. ch. 1. 5. and 16, and as was constantly Sworn till the Revolution.*

6. *If he mean, says Mr. H. by the Good of the King, his being unresisted, and continuing in the possession of his Headship, his Business should have been to prove, that this would be more, in all Cases, for the Publick Good, than Resistance.* But how will Mr. H. prove, that this was to have been his Business, when it certainly was not? It is enough for his purpose, that it ordinarily is so. And if it rarely, very rarely prove otherwise; if one Rebellion in a hundred escape the dire effects of the other Ninety and Nine, who but Mr. H. would not think this abundantly sufficient Evidence, of the great Mischief of Resistance, to the Subject as well as to the Prince, tho' the Event should not be the same in all Cases, not one excepted?

And thus it appears, after all Mr. H. has said to the contrary, that the Good of the Society, implies in it the Good of the Head as well as of the Inferiour Members, and that to afflict and hurt the Head, tho' in order to any advantage the other Parts may hope for by it, can never tend to the Welfare of the whole, and indeed very seldom, if ever, to the benefit of any considerable part of it. Some bold daring Spirits may possibly gain by disturbing the ordinary course of Affairs, and may build their Fortunes for a time upon the ruin of others. But besides, that this is ordinarily but for a time, *their Wickedness very frequently falling upon their own Head*, or that of their immediate Posterity; besides this, I say, great Multitudes are undone to raise them, and so the Community in general suffers to a great degree, in the other Parts, as well as the Head, the Prince, whose Sufferings alone (especially if hereto be added, those of the whole Royal Family who usually are great Sufferers with him) testify that Body whereof he is the Head to be but in a bad condition, whilst he, the Head, is so.

And I conclude therefore with this excellent Author, † *that if the keeping of Allegiance should seem to any one, at some time not to serve the greater degree of Publick Good,*

† *Plea of Publick Good, p. 6.*

so well as the casting it off would; that rare and accidental Disservice must be overborn by the Goodness of the general Rule, and is abundantly compensated by the general and ordinary Convenience.

The sum of what is hitherto said in this Chapter is, that the Safety and Happiness of the Society is not the only End of Government, but Almighty God has other wise and good purposes to serve by it, particularly to keep up in Men's Minds a Sense of his Dominion, and the relation we all stand in to him, and that all Impiety may be discountenanc'd and punish'd, and his Worship encourag'd and taken care of; and yet if it had been so, this would not do Mr *H*'s Business, as not being sufficient to maintain his Doctrine of Resistance; both because all Resistance is forbidden in Scripture, and because the Good of the Head is included in that of the Publick, at least as much as of any other part of the Body.

Mr. *H.* adds, that *The appointing them to Govern is nothing else, but an appointing that Submission should be paid to them.* Then I hope it is not an appointing that they should be resisted, whensoever they fail of governing as they ought, whensoever they *deflect from the Will of God*, and do not apply themselves as they might to promote the *Publick Good*. This I take to be a necessary Consequence, and which Mr *H.* will not readily get over. But now to the Proposition; *the Appointing them to Govern is nothing else, but an Appointing Submission to be paid to them.* Another would have been apt to think, that *Appointing Rulers to Govern*, had been not only to give them Authority over others, but to lay a charge upon them likewise in order to a due Execution of the Office hereby given them; and that the Subjects Obedience to them was the matter of another Command, such as this given by *St. Paul* to all Subjects, of obeying, and not resisting those who are thus put in Authority. And it is a certain Truth, that *Appointing any to Govern* is laying a Duty upon them, which they are thenceforward obliged to attend to, as they will answer the neglect of it to Almighty God; but is no more an *Ap-
pointing*

pointing that Submission shall be paid them by their People, than requiring the People to obey them, is a Commissioning them to Govern. Which I presume no one will pretend it to be, they being two very distinct Acts. And indeed, according to this new Doctrine, *David, the Man after God's own Heart,* could not be a good Ruler, when his People revolted from him, because *Submission* was not then paid him. Nor on the contrary, could either *Jeroboam* or *Ahab* be bad Governors, whilst the People concurred with the one, in the Worship of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, and with the other in the Service of *Baal*, it being certain, that *Submission* was then paid to them in each of these Cases. This is something that *may be urged*, and very justly too, against what Mr *H.* here asserts. And it is very far from being *horrible Blasphemy*, or from *making it*, as he pretends, part of God's *positive Commission to Rulers*, to *transgress their own Duty*, and to *ruin the People committed to their Charge*.

Whether teaching Subjects to resist their Governors, whensoever they shall think it requisite, be *speaking evil* of Dignities, or *vilifying the Lord's Anointed*, may in a good Measure be collected from what hath hitherto been offer'd, but will be yet more evident before I come to the end of this Discourse, and therefore I shall say nothing of it here.

Thus I have given some account of Mr *H.*'s Five foregoing Propositions; and I hope I have made it appear, that there is nothing of Solidity or good Argument in any of them; and that his only Business has been to father his own groundless Notions upon the Apostle, in open defiance to both the Words and meaning of his Text.


C. H. A. P. VI.

Whether Mr. H. has been so prudent and cautious in Preaching this Doctrine, as he professes himself to have been?

NOW I must attend Mr. H. a while in relation to what he pleads, in Vindication of his own Prudence and Caution, in teaching Subjects *the Lawfulness of Resisting in some Cases*. This, says Mr. H. is not delivered with that great imprudence and extreme want of Caution, which some would make the World believe. And he may value himself as much as he pleases upon it. But if one should undertake to preach up the Lawfulness of Idolatry, Gluttony, Drunkenness, Pride, Uncleaness, Robbery, or the like, I doubt it would be thought but a poor Plea for him here, and will stand him in very little stead at the last Day, that he did it with Caution and Prudence. And I am yet to learn, where the difference lies as to Preaching up Rebellion, or in Mr. H's own Words, *the Lawfulness of Resisting in some Cases*. The only Caution and Prudence that I know allowable, in relation to any sort of Sin, is not to Preach it up at all; and next to this, to repent of and retract the Preaching of it. And I heartily wish Mr. H. had been so cautious and prudent, as to have taken either of these courses. But let us see what he has to say for himself.

1. *If he has been as cautious and prudent in laying down the true Doctrine of Non-resistance as the Apostle himself hath been, he might hope, one would think, to escape free from all severe Censures.* No doubt but he might. And they would be very unreasonable Men, and very indifferent Christians, that would bear hard ~~him~~ upon him in this case. Yet that he has stuck thus close to the Apostle, he did not doubt would have been very evident to all

all who heard, or read his Sermon. It seems he has a very good opinion of this Sermon himself, and expects that all his Readers should have it too. But I can assure him a great number of them have had a very different notion of it, and earnestly wished for his own sake, as well as for the sake of his mistaken Admirers, that he had been so cautious and prudent as never to have preached it. And with very good Reason. For does St. Paul *, whom he was to follow, make the least mention of Resistance, as lawful in any Case? Does he plead for it in any respect? Does he ever affirm that wicked and destructive Governors may, and ought to be opposed? This, it is true, is Mr. H's. Doctrine; and it agrees as well with S. Paul's, as Heat and Cold, or Light and Darkness agree with each other. For the Apostle requires Subjection to the *Higher Powers* in general, and declares them, without distinction, to be the *Ordinance of God*, and as such to be irresistible, upon pain of *Damnation*. And had he really designed to condemn all manner of Resistance of our Governors, in whatsoever case, what could he have been expected to say more, than he has already said? Could he have laid a surer Foundation for their Authority, or that might strike a greater awe of them into their Subjects, than by assuring us that they are *God's Ordinance*? Could he have put a more effectual bar in the way of Resistance, and forcible Opposition to them, than by condemning all attempts of this nature, as a *Resisting the Ordinance of God*? Or could he have ratified his Prohibition with a severer Sanction, than what we meet with in the following Words, that *they who resist shall receive to themselves Damnation*? If this be not a sufficient provision against Resistance, what one Sin is there that may not be freely ventured upon, and that Mr. H. may not recommend to his Auditory, with the same grace, the same prudence and caution, that he does this? There is none in either the Old or New Testa-

ment, whose Prohibition is enforced with a more dreadful Commination, or which deserves to be more seriously attended to, and provided against, than this of Eternal *DAMNATION*; Which Mr. *H.* owns † to be here intended by the Apostle. Or if he had not, it were easily proved that this || must be the import of the Word in this place; from the Obligation that *lies* upon all in point of Conscience to be in Subjection to their Governors, *v.* 5. and the Sin of acting contrary to it; from the great Guilt of *resisting* a known *Ordinance of God*, *v.* 2. and because otherwise here were no Penalty at all threatened to a successful Rebel, who is not punished, but abundantly rewarded for his wickedness, in this World; and so has nothing to debar him from continuing in it, unless he be in danger of *Damnation* in the other. To which Considerations I also add in the last place, that though the Word *Κεῖμα*, in its Original and Primary Signification means only *Judgment*, yet seeing not only *Hesychius* renders it *ἀντιπόδους δειξ*, but in the Language of the New Testament, particularly in these following Texts, *S. Mat.* 23. 14. *S. Luke* 20, 47. 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. and 5. 12. *S. Jam.* 3. 1. *S. Jud.* 4. it is used for *κατάκριμα*, and so imports no less than Eternal *Damnation*, there can be no reason  given why it should not do so here.

† Page 35.

|| This Word must also include the *Judgment of God*, and his condemnation. For since this Resistance is a *Sin*, and against the *Ordinance of God*, *v.* 2. that Person who puts himself upon breaking his Commands, and opposing his Authority, must thereby render himself *guilty* before God; or in *S. Chrysostom's* Expression concerning this Text, he doth *θεὸν παρεξυμνεῖν*, provoke God, and must expect from him *δίκην σφοδρὰν καὶ ὀνείδην*, heavy judgment. *Dr Falkner's* Christian Loyalty, l. 2: c. 4. p. 485. And yet these words of *S. Chrysostom* are of a much higher importance, signifying no less than the most excessively intolerable Punishment.

All Mr. *H.* has to say in justification of his Doctrine is, that * *The Apostle proves Governors to be the Ordinance of God, only from the excellent usefulness of their Office to humane Society, and founds the necessity of Submission, and paying Tribute, upon the useful and good End of their Office only.* But what if Mr. *H.* have mistaken the Apostle, and this be not the only Consideration whereupon *S. Paul* presses the Duty of Submission? Then the necessary consequence must be, that Submission may still be due to ill Governors, notwithstanding any thing Mr. *H.* has said to the contrary.

Now that the Usefulness of Government is not the only proof of their being the *Ordinance of God*, I thought I had already made very evident, in treating of the Fifth Proposition. But because Mr. *H.* † brings it over again, I shall here allow it a farther Consideration. And whosoever but attends to the two first Verses of the Chapter, will easily see, that the Apostle founds our Obligation to subjection upon another bottom, namely the relation Governors stand in to Almighty God, as I have before observed. Which he speaks of all Governors; and must be owned to do so, unless Mr. *H.* can find out a *medium* to prove, that when the Apostle says, *there are no Powers but of God*, he can be understood to intend, either that there can be no bad Governors, or that such are no Governors at all, and so not included in that general Assertion. The Apostle there declares Governors to be the *Ordinance of God*, not from the *usefulness of their Office*, but from their Divine Appointment, and as they are from Him; they are *ordained of God*, and this the Apostle makes the foundation, as well he might, of their being his Ordinance. This is a natural, and a necessary inference; but that they are *God's Ordinance*, only because their Office is beneficial to Mankind, is a consequence that is neither necessary, nor natural.

* Page 34.

† Ibid.

I grant, the Apostle having thus established our obligation to Subjection, proceeds to enforce the practice of it, from the singular Advantage that is intended to Mankind by Government, and the great Benefit we usually reap by it. Yet he never tells us that this is the only Foundation of our Obedience, and when Princes deflect from the constant pursuit of this, they cease to be God's Ordinance, or to have any Obedience due to them. Nor is it to be imagined that he should. For a Prince's acting unagreeably to the End of his Government, does not prove him to be no Governor, but only that he is a bad one ; and so he is really a Governor, though not so good as he ought to be. And if he be in any sense a supream lawful Governor (for such only are of God, and such only he owns to be the *Higher Powers*, as I have shewn at large in the first Chapter,) if he be, I say, in any sense a supream lawful Governor, he is one of the *Powers ordained of God*, and not to be resisted.

And what if he act contrary to the End of his Institution? He is then, as I said, an ill Governor ; he sins against Almighty God who is his Lord and Sovereign, and must accordingly be sure to be strictly accountable to him for his Misgovernment. But how does this make him no Governour, and prove that *resistance to him*, is not *resistance to the Ordinance of God* ?

A Man was made to serve and obey God his Creator and Sovereign Lord. Wherefore if he take a contrary course, and instead of living up to the Ends of his Creation, indulge himself in all sorts of Wickedness, bidding defiance to the Almighty, and daily breaking his known Laws, this makes him a bad Man ; but I take it for granted, Mr. H. will allow him to be a Man still, though a corrupt, a wicked, a vicious and very sinful Man.

A Steward is designed by his Lord to manage his Estate, and govern his inferiour Servants, as may seem most to his advantage: Yet if this Steward act quite contrary, and waste his Master's Goods, be negligent in his Office, and abuse and *smite his fellow-Servants*, and
eat

eat and drink with the Drunken, this shews him a very bad Steward, but does not divest him of his Office, till his Lord, in whose only Power it is, thinks fit to lay him aside. So our Blessed Lord determines it in his Parable; * *The Lord of that Servant shall come in a day, when he looketh not for him, &c.* clearly implying that he is still a Servant, though very ill deserving to be so.

But to argue from *S. Paul* himself. I know no better way to explain his meaning, than by enquiring whether *Mr. H's* manner of interpretation will hold in other parallel expressions of the same Apostle, who must best have understood his own meaning. For if it do not, it is to be presumed, *Mr. H.* will suspect that he may have happened to mistake in this before us. *Ephes. 6. 4.* The Apostle gives this Instruction, *Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* And on the other hand, *Colos. 3. 20.* *Children are required to obey their Parents in all things;* and this consideration is added as the foundation of such their Obedience, *for this is well pleasing unto the Lord.* Which words sufficiently discover the End of a Parent's Authority over his Children to be, that he may require of them such things as are *well pleasing to the Lord*; for it is only in this case they are to be obeyed. But it does not follow from hence, that if Parents do *provoke their children to wrath*, contrary to the Apostle's Prohibition, and the design of their Paternal Authority; if they grow unreasonable and tyrannical, and often times require things in no wise pleasing to God; it does not follow, I say, from hence, that their Children may cast off all Duty and Reverence for them, and look upon them as no longer the Parents, to whom Obedience is required, and so disregard them, and not hearken to even their just and lawful Commands; and yet less that they may turn them out of doors, and seize upon their Estate, and

* *S. Mat. 24. 50.*

divide it amongst themselves. As Mr. *H.* supposes may be done to a Prince, when he teaches Subjects, not only to withdraw their active Obedience in some cases, but to resist and expell him, as if he were not God's Ordinance.

The case is the same likewise in relation to our Spiritual Governors, to whom *S. Paul* enjoins all Reverence and Obedience, and particularly upon the account of their great care and labour for the welfare of our Souls. *Heb. 13. 17. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves; for they watch for your Souls, as they that must give an account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief.* Does Mr. *H.* think Obedience is not due to these, as well by means of their being God's Ministers and Ambassadors, as upon account of their faithful discharge of their Office? Suppose any ^{one} of these to be idle, and negligent, and not watch duly for the People's Souls, as one that must give an account of his Stewardship amongst them; this shews him not to answer the End of his Institution, and that he is not such a faithful Minister of God as he ought to be, and does not come up to what is here given as a reason, why they ought to obey him, and the only reason for it mentioned in this place. Which is more than can be said in respect to *Rom. 13th*, where the usefulness of Government is not the only, nor in truth the Principal reason for submitting to the *Higher Powers*. Yet whilst this negligent useles Minister has his Commission to act as God's Minister, he is accountable only to God Almighty, and his Ecclesiastical Superiours; and his People must expect to answer it at their peril, if they refuse to accept of his Ministry, till they can get him either reformed, or regularly removed. Nor can they tumultuously rise up against him, and forcibly expell him, without offering violence to the Laws both of God and his Church, and contracting to themselves the guilt of usurping a Power, which in no wise belongs to them.

Thus

Thus according to *S. Paul's* way of arguing in other cases, it is evident *Mr. H.* has not shewn such admirable caution or prudence in interpreting these words of the Apostle.

And if we attend only to the Words themselves, they are full against him: For the Apostle here gives two distinct Reasons, against Resisting the Higher Powers; the first and principal, that they have a Divine Commission, and it is therefore both highly undutiful, and extremely dangerous to rise up against them; the other, that they are appointed for the good of Mankind, and resisting them is therefore a publick Mischief. Or the words may be branched out * into more Particulars, all worthy of serious consideration, and naturally tending to press the Duty upon us, and recommend it the more effectually to our Practice. But

* This Duty to Sovereign, and other subordinate Authority derived from that, the Apostle argues from several very excellent Topicks, and undeniably proves from them all, what Obligation Subjects have to obey and honour their Governours. 1. This he proves from the Divine Original of Government, because *the Powers that be are ordained of God.* 2. From the eternal Punishment, without hearty Repentance, of those who disobey; *they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.* 3. From their temporal Punishment, and the usual Fate of Traitors and Mutineers, *he beareth not the Sword in vain.* 4. He urges this Duty further, from the usefulness of the Governour to secure us in our Just Rights against all Oppressors; because *he is the Minister to us for good, and an Avenger to execute Wrath upon him that doth evil.* And lastly to conclude all, he exhorts Christians not only to ground their Duty upon the Wrath, or Vindictive Power of the Magistrate, or upon any other Secular Motive; but to fix it chiefly upon the foot of Religion and Conscience, as the Command of Almighty God, as the Doctrine of our Blessed Lord, and a Rule of the wisest and most peaceable Institution that ever was in the World, *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake.* *Dr. Nichols's Duty of Inferiours to Superiours. Disc. I. P. 2, 3.*

Mr.

Mr. *H.* perhaps may be the first that has taken upon him to reduce them only to one Argument, and drop that which is incomparably the most weighty of all, the Terrors of everlasting Destruction threatened to Resistance. And it is hard to suppose that none should have understood them aright, till he came to make the first discovery of their true meaning. Especially when we reflect how clearly and intelligibly the Apostle has expressed himself; in so much that *he who runneth may not only read the Words, but may at first penetrate into the true and genuine design and importance of them.*

The sum is, that Mr. *H.*'s Exposition of S. *Paul's* Precept concerning Obedience to the *higher Powers*, is not only unreasonable in it self, but is moreover a great force put upon the Words, and concludes from them what the Apostle cannot by any fair construction be conceived to have meant by them; Besides that it is confuted by other like Expressions of the same Apostle, where this method of interpreting is by no means allowable; And by consequence, that Mr. *H.* has not been so cautious and prudent as he professes himself to have been, not having *followed* the Apostle's Doctrine, as he owns he ought to do, but having invented another of his own in direct Opposition to it.

More than this needs not be said as to the forced account Mr. *H.* gives of the Apostle's Words. And less could not be said, considering how positive he is in asserting his own Gloss, as the only proper sense of the Apostle, and what he was therefore obliged to stick to when he had undertaken to explain S. *Paul's* Doctrine in this point. And since it hence appears that *the Apostle's Expressions and Reasoning both can and ought to be extended farther than he has extended them*, namely so far as † to require a Passive Submission to bad Governors, as well as an Active to good, I hope he will

† 'Ουχ ἀπλῶς ἐπι, περιέστω, ἀλλ' ὑποτασσέσθω. B. Chrysost. in loc.

remember his Promise of making all the Reparation possible for the injury he has done to this great Apostle.

And as to his unkind and disingenuous insinuation in what follows, I dare take upon me to assure him, that those who most dislike his manner of proceeding hitherto, are not dissatisfied with him, because he has given a Description of the Office of Princes, and given an account of their Duty, at the same time that he has given an account of the Duty of their Subjects. He may Preach upon this Head as long as he pleases, and need not fear they will ever be offended at him for it ; provided he keep within due bounds, and impose no new Duty upon Princes, and which the Scripture has not imposed ; all their exception to him being only that he has not given so much as a tolerable account of the Duty of Subjects, or that can in any measure be reconciled to S. Paul's Doctrine, or that suits with that Submission which is required of them in other places of Scripture.

2. This is so plain and obvious, that Mr. H. himself in the next Paragraph owns a remarkable Difference between the Apostle's Words and his Explication of them. * *I confess*, says he, *there is this difference between this Passage of S. Paul, and the foregoing Sermon, that there is no Case put by S. Paul in express Words, in which Opposition to Governors is allowed.* Which methinks is a good testimony against himself ; and ought to caution his Readers, that they beware of a Doctrine, whose Author cannot but confess it to be different from that of the Apostle.

Yet this Mr. H. makes very light of : *It is easy he thinks to give a good Account of this single and only Difference.* However, let us see what Difference he owns ; and I think it is a very material one, that *there is no Case put by St. Paul in express Words, in which Opposition to Governors is allowed.* That the Apostle should allow of no Case for Opposition to Governors, and Mr. H.

should plead strongly for it in several Cases, is a Difference that I should have thought it not *easy to give a good Account of*. Oh! says Mr *H.* but he does not put a Case in *express Words*. And what should his Readers understand by this, but that there is so much plainly intimated, tho' not delivered *totidem verbis*? I appeal to any impartial Judge, whether any other Sense can be made of these Words, and whether Mr *H.* could have any other end in using them, than hereby to impose upon his less cautious Readers, as if the Apostle had hinted some such exceptionable Case, tho' he had not expressly stated it. And yet does Mr *H.* undertake to maintain any such oblique Hint in the Apostle's Doctrine? By no means: For after he has insinuated as if there were, in the very next Words he professes to shew, that it was not necessary; and by consequence the Apostle could not make any such exception, without impertinently asserting, an unnecessary Doctrine. And for this weighty Reason, *because there were none among the Roman Heathens themselves who could bear with such a Notion as this, That Subjects ought to suffer themselves to be oppressed and made miserable, without Reluctance, at the Will of their Emperors.* A powerful Argument indeed! The *Heathen Romans*, if they were at any time oppressed and made miserable by their Emperors, suffered it not without uneasiness and *Reluctance*. This does not seem to reconcile the Difference betwixt the Apostle's Doctrine and Mr *H.*'s. yet this is all the Words necessarily import. Nevertheless, let us take them in a higher Sense, tho' not obliged to it, and suppose that by *Reluctance* is here meant, to include in it Forcible Resistance; yet neither will this do Mr *H.*'s Business, because being no proof that the Apostle ought not to have made any exceptions, if he had intended them. Wherefore let us look again, and try if the next Words may not help him out. † *Nor was it the Apostle's Business to give an express Allowance for Resistance in such a Case, because*

none of those to whom he wrote denied it, and all their Neighbours allowed it. This to me is as good an Argument, that *S. Paul* ought to have made exceptions to this Doctrine of Passive Submission, if he had intended any, that *so those to whom he wrote, and their Neighbours* about them, might not have any unnecessary Prejudices against Christianity laid in their way, as that he ought not to have made any, because they did not need them, as *Mr H.* supposes. But besides, *Mr H.* affirms, all those to whom the Apostle wrote, and all about them, to have been for Resistance upon occasion. Which I think must mean all the *Romans*, whether *Christians*, *Jews* or *Heathens*. If he say *All the Christians*, I should desire a little proof of this, and not a bare groundless Assertion, that *none of them denied it*; when it is so obvious to conclude from other places of Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, that they neither did, nor could grant it. If *All the Jews*, this likewise would need good proof, seeing their Law makes no allowance for it; so that the Patrons of Resistance are forced to leave the Canonical Scripture, and fly to the History of the *Maccabees*, for proof that they ever admitted it. Tho' if they had, this would have been no reason why the Apostle should not forbid them it entirely for the future. If the *Heathens All* granted it, it is yet incumbent upon *Mr. H.* to make it out, that this Persuasion was not one of those Errors the Apostle was sent to remove from amongst them, and that he did not purposely design to do it, in what he has here written to the *Romans*. That he did design it may justly be inferr'd from this one Observation, that the Converts to Christianity, whether *Greeks* or *Romans*, upon their embracing the Gospel, renounced their former Principles of Resistance, as will appear from the account I am to give hereafter, of the Behaviour of the Ancient Christians towards their merciless persecuting Emperors. For no other cause can be assigned of such an universal change in them, but that the Laws of their Religion imposed it upon them, as they would escape the *Damnation of Hell*, the *Damnation* threatned by *St. Paul*

St. Paul to the Disobedient and Rebellious. His business was not to soothe Men in their Sins of whatever nature ; but to condemn and dissuade from them, and press and urge to a renunciation of them. And when he has done this clearly and fully, it is highly unbecoming a Preacher of the Gospel, to evacuate his Precepts, by pleading that those he undertook to instruct at that time, or their Followers since, were not to understand him according to the plain literal meaning of his Words, but suitably to their own preconceived Erroneous Opinions. This is no better than to expound away the plainest Doctrines of the Gospel ; and a ready way to render all that our Saviour and his Apostles have taught us of none effect. In as much as there is no reason, why all the other Precepts of our Religion may not in like manner be set aside by these Pretences, as of no use to those who are of a contrary Persuasion.

Mr. H. proceeds thus, * *He was to oppose another extreme, which was the Opinion of those, who thought no Subjection due in Point of Conscience to Heathen Magistrates, even in the Execution of their Office. And the Resistance founded upon this Opinion, or any like to it, is the only Resistance which he here condemns, or which his Argument can conclude against.* This Plea has a particular respect to the *Jews*, and might have been of some force had this Epistle been written only to the *Jews* then at, or about *Rome*. But whosoever looks back to the first Chapter, will find v. 7. that it is directed to all that were at *Rome*, beloved of God, called to be *Saints*, that is, to all the Christians there without distinction, whether of *Jewish* or *Gentile* Extraction. Or if he look forward to the last Chapter, and observe the names of the Disciples there mentioned by the Apostle, he will see they are all *Greek* and *Latin* Names, but only *Mary*, or rather *Miriam*, v. 6. The like may be

* Ibid.

noted of the Conclusions of * others of his Epistles. And in the last Chapter to the *Philippians*, v. 22. the Apostle speaks of the Saints of *Nero's* Household, who, it is most reasonably to be supposed, were Heathen not *Jewish* Converts: Whence it appears that the Convert *Jews* were but a Part, and in all probability but a small Part of the Christians then at *Rome*. And by consequence it will be hard to conceive that the Apostle should have had a regard only to them in this Precept, unless they had been some way particularly singled out from the rest; which they are not. It seems rather to have been given upon the account of the Persecutions, that the Christians in general were like afterwards to undergo, from their cruel and tyrannical Governors, to prevent their seeking to redress themselves by embroiling States, raising Insurrections, and Tumults, or using any unlawful means for shaking off so heavy a Yoke. As also appears farther, from the Apostle's arguing for submission from the divine Institution of Government. And it is strange therefore that when the Apostle teaches, that *to resist the Power is to resist the Ordinance of God*, and a damning Sin, Mr. *H.* should venture to affirm, that the Apostle does not design to forbid all Resistance, but only to teach that some Obedience was due to *Heathen Magistrates*, who are to be submitted to by their Subjects, so far only as they shall think it for their temporal Advantage. If the Apostle had meant no more than this, he could as easily have said it as Mr. *H.* But when he does not say so, but says of Resistance in general, that it is a heinous Offence, and exceeding Dangerous, that it is no less than a *Resisting God's Ordinance*, and exposing our selves to his Eternal Vengeance, pressing it in the most serious and important manner, and without any reserve for the worst of Princes, this seems a loud call to a Submission of as large Extent, as the Words wherein it is required are

* 1 Cor. 16. Colos. 4. Where are only two Hebrew Names, *Barnabas*, and *Jesus*, 2 Tim. 4.

of. Nor is this truth in the least contradicted by the Apostle's enforcing the Duty, by a farther consideration of the Benefit of Government, and the good that thereby redounds to Society. Much less can it be disproved, by whatsoever *Notion* Mr. H. may have, of St. Paul's great regard for the Rights and Liberties of the *Inferiour part of Mankind*; since it is plain the Apostle had a much greater concern upon him, for the *Eternal Salvation* of those to whom he wrote, and was far more solicitous to preserve them from *Damnation*, and teach them what they were to do for *Conscience sake*, and in order to the pleasing Almighty God, and preparing themselves for a better State; which he always looked upon to be infinitely beyond all the most valuable concerns of this poor, transient, uncertain Life.

What Mr. H. adds next, I readily assent to, that when S. Peter tells us of *some things* hard to be understood in S. Paul's Writings, which the Ignorant and Unlearned in those Days, wrested to their own Destruction, I believe he little thought, that this Passage was so hard to be understood, that many even of the Knowing and Learned should wrest it. Only I cannot add what he does, not to their own Destruction, indeed, but to the Destruction of whole Nations. For I am greatly afraid, if the Doctrine of Mr. H. and such Expositors as he, were generally entertained, it would not only tend to the Destruction of whole Nations of their Followers, but to their Own in a more peculiar manner. Which I therefore most heartily beg of him seriously to consider, before it be too late.

And now I think I may justly conclude this Point almost in Mr. H's. own words, Had not the Apostle been so express as he is against all Resistance, * Yet for my own part (leaving others always to judge for themselves) I cannot but think, had there been any such Opinion as this [of the Lawfulness of Resisting bad Governors] amongst those to whom He wrote, that He of all Men,

would have set himself to oppose it, and with the greatest Zeal have condemned it: Such a Notion have I of his great regard to the eternal Happiness and Salvation, not only of the Inferiour part, but of all Mankind.

Here I might have taken notice of a Reflection not so very just, upon some Men; but whom, is as hard to discover, as who were his * many that instructed him so well in our old Laws; Of these he cannot but observe that they hardly ever run their Panegyricks so high, or press Subjection so far, as in the case of those Princes who have the least Title to them. But I let this pass.

3. Having given an Account of the difference between the Text and the foregoing Sermon; (though it had been much better they had not differed at all, and that he had no more varied from the Apostle than those he opposes do,) he next proceeds to lay before the Reader the Words in which he has expressed his own Sense, upon the Subject of Resistance, that he may judge himself, how great a want of Caution there is in the choice of them. To this end, passing over divers others already considered, he instances in this, † Tamely to sit still, and see the Happiness of Society entirely ruined, and sacrificed to the irregular Will of one Man, seems a greater contradiction to the Will and Design of God, than any opposition can be. For it is a tacit Consent to the Ruine and Misery of Mankind. So that, says he, I blame not here a Passive Non-resistance, unless it be when a Society is entirely ruined without Resistance.

1. This seems not well to consist with what he had said before, || If They [Princes] use their Power—— to the hurt and prejudice of Humane Society, they act not in any such instances by Authority from God: Nor can they in such instances be called his Vicegerents, without the highest Profaneness; And therefore to oppose them in such

* Page 113.

† Pag. 38.

|| Pag. 24.

*cases cannot be to oppose the Authority of God. In the one of these Cases Mr. H. makes a total Subversion necessary to legitimate Resistance; in the other it is sufficient that the Prince use his Power to the hurt and prejudice of Humane Society; which may be done several ways without a total Subversion. Here Mr. H. needs as much to be reconciled to himself, as he did before, to S. Paul. Nay, he says further, * Subjects are not obliged to Submission, in point of Conscience, to those Governors who answer not the end of their Institution. And what he means by this he explains a few lines after. It is manifest that this Sentence frees Subjects from Submission, in Point of Conscience, to no Governors, but those only, under whom the Universal Happiness of the Society is not secured. So that according to Mr. H. in this place, Subjects are not only discharged of all Duty to those Governors who seek the Ruine, the entire Ruine of the Society, as his forementioned Plea limits it, but to those too who do not duly apply themselves to the Securing the Happiness of the Society. Than which no Rebel will desire a greater Latitude for Resistance; since upon this Supposition he can never want a fair Pretence for it.*

2. If no less than a *Total Subversion* will warrant Resistance, how will Mr. H. ever be able, according to his own Principles, to resist with a good Conscience before it is too late, and his Resistance will do him no longer any Good? Whilst the *Subversion* is but *in fieri*, it may meet with some Discouragement, that may alter the Sovereign's measures, or many other impediments may happen, that it may never come to be Total. And if it be not, Mr. H's. Plea is plainly over-ruled by his own Confession.

3. If Resistance is not lawful but when the Society is *entirely ruined* without it, where will Mr. H. find a Prince to resist? For though many Princes have committed great outrages upon their Subjects, abused, im-

poverished, disgraced and slain many of them, none have ever attempted to do this to their whole People. That would be to unking themselves, to make them only nominal Princes, without Subjects either to obey them, or assist them in their Exigences. And no King in his wits would ever go about to degrade himself in such a manner. It was as foolish, as barbarous a wish of *Caligula*, † that *the whole People of Rome had but one Neck*, that he might destroy them all at one blow. In as much as he could never have had a Will to extirpate all his People, if it could have been in his Power. As also on the other hand, if he had been ever so eagerly set upon doing it, he could never have it in his Power. Such wicked, tyrannical, cruel, inhumane Governors may do a great deal of Mischief, and may totally ruine a great part of their Subjects. But still this is not an *entire Ruine of the whole Society*; which Mr. H. in this place makes necessary in order to the Lawfulness of Resistance. Nor is this Argument at all answered, *Pag. 90, &c.* for I do not pretend to deny that Princes may do many things against the Interest of the Publick; may go contrary to their known Duty in divers respects; and may have too often been observed to do so. Only I say that this is but to the Destruction of some of their Subjects, and the Damage of others, and not to the *entire Ruine* of all the Society.

3. Mr. H. has not acquainted us who is to be the Judge to determine what is an entire Subversion, and when by virtue hereof the People may warrantably Resist. This Question he complains || *can be repeated, without the least notice of what has been said in answer to it.* And yet I must beg leave to repeat it again, and desire to know of him, * with the learned Mr. Lesley, *Who shall be Judge?* For these following Reasons.

† *Utinam P. R. unam cervicem haberet. Sueton. in vit. C. Calig. c. 30.*

|| *Pref. P. xlii.*

* *Rehearsals, Vol. 3. Numb. 7, 12, 17, and Vol. 4. Numb. 4.*

1. Because

1. Because I do not observe any thing in all he has said that is at all a satisfactory Answer to it. I grant he affirms, † *The Subjects themselves* are to Judge; *who alone feel the necessity of it, and alone will suffer for the want of it.* And here he talks of *Infallibility*, and says, *no Doctrine was ever accounted false, because some People might mistake in the understanding or application of it;* and that *Private Persons* are allowed to judge for themselves in matters of equal or greater moment or difficulty. All which I take to be besides the Question; not because of their incapacity to judge aright, as he pretends some say, but because he does not shew they are ever allowed to judge for themselves in matters of *Meum* and *Tuum*; which he ought to have done, if he would be thought to answer this Question. And yet neither so had he answered it, though he had come nearer doing it, than he has now. He had not Answered it even then, I say, and for this plain Reason I say it, because he has not shewn any Authority the People have to Judge in this Case. They have *Mr. Hs.* Commission for it; and || that is all the Commission they have, that I can find. And yet a Commission

K 4

em-

† Page 171, &c.

|| *Bracton*, that old Lawyer his friends told him of, testifies that *contra ipsum* (*De Leg. & Constit. Angl. l. 4. c. 10.*) *non habebitur remedium per Affixam, immo tantum locus erit Supplicationi, ut factum suum corrigat & emendet, quod si non fecerit, sufficiat ei pro pœna, quod Dominum expectet ultorem, qui dicit, mihi vindictam, & ego retribuam; nisi sit qui dicat, quod universitas Regni & Baronagium suum hoc facere debeat, & possit in curia ipsius Regis.* Whether the Lords and Commons may appear in Court against the King in case of a disseizure by Affize, *Bracton* does not here determine. But in another place he delivers it as *Law l. 1. c. 8.* that none may question his procedure, much less set themselves to oppose it. *Si autem ab eo petatur, (cum breve non currat contra ipsum) locus erit supplicationi quod factum suum corrigat & emendet, quod quidem si non fecerit, satis sufficit ei ad pœnam* quod

empowering them thus to Judge, is necessary, before they can warrantably take upon them to do it. For it is not their being certain of their Grievances will authorize them to act as Judges, unless the Laws of the Constitution confer this Right upon them. It oftentimes falls out that many of the Lawyers at the Barr, may be as well capacitated to give a right Judgment as any of those upon the Bench, yet their Judgment signifies nothing at all towards the determining of a Suit, or the punishment of a Delinquent, because they are not authorized to pass a Sentence in either Case. And though Mr. *H.* feel himself ever so much aggrieved by any of his Neighbours, this will not bear him out in making reprisal, upon account of what he feels; but he must wait for the Determination of a legal Judge, before he can hope for reparation to be made him. This I think is enough to evince that the Peoples feeling themselves distressed does not qualifie them to give a legal and valid Judgment, till they are appointed to do it by the Laws and Rules of the Constitution. And his Instances of the People's Judging who shall be their Prince in Kingdoms *perfectly Elective*, and here at home, who are fit to be our Representatives in Parliament, are so far from establishing his Assertion, that they are directly against him, The People do no more in either of these cases, than what they are warranted to do by the Frame and Laws of their Constitution. And all that can be inferred from hence is, that where the People are constituted Judges of their Prince's good Behaviour, they may take upon them to act accordingly; but not in any other Case, nor where the Constitution gives them no power to do it, and particularly not in our Nation, whose Law knows of no such Judges.

quod Dominum expectet ultorem. Nemo quidem de factis suis præsumat disputare, multo fortius contra factum suum venire. This is Mr. *H.*'s. Old Lawyer who calls a Tyrannical King the Minister of the Devil; and yet I conceive he will not find much advantage in his Determination. Which possibly may be the Reason, why he chose not to name him.

2. Because to make the People Judges as Mr. *H.* does, is to appoint them to Judge in their own Cause; and so they become both Parties and Judges. And then it is easie to determine before hand for whom they will give their Judgment, whatever the Case be.

3. Because it is not imaginable that our Laws which ordain Judges to determine any the least Controversie between the Subjects, would leave the King, † who is the Fountain of the Law, without any one to Judge for him, though in the weightiest Concern. If the Law be so tender of the People's Interest, that one cannot have the least part of his Estate recovered from him, but by a trial before a legal Judge empowered to give Sentence for or against him; who can believe the same Law should leave the Sovereign without any redress against his Subjects, or any one or more appointed to give Judgment, when resisting him may be lawful, and when not? This to me makes it a clear Case that our Law knows no Resistance. Which also is yet farther evident in that there is no Resisting in any Case, which our Law does not make Treason; and where it will not condemn the Resister as a Traitor, if it have him in it's Power.

For these Reasons I put this Question again, and am perswaded it ought to be put over and over again, till Mr. *H.* can give some more satisfactory Answer to it, than we have yet had either from himself, or any else. And this therefore is my third Objection to this Assertion of Mr. *H.*s. that we have no Judge appointed to determine when the Society is so *entirely ruined*, as that the People may safely, and with a good Conscience, take upon them to Resist their Sovereign.

4. In the fourth and last place I add, that Mr. *H.*s. Doctrine opens a Door for Resisting not only the King, or Queen, but (which perhaps his Admirers have little attended to) both Houses of Parliament too, whenso-

† Our Law books call *the King the Fountain of Justice and the Life of the Law.* Jenkins Rediviv. P. 77. *He is fons legum.* Symmons's Loyal Subjects belief, p. 8.

ever the People see themselves Oppressed by them. Had *Julian Johnson* been now alive, how would he have rebuked him for this New Heterodoxy, so far beyond what he had ever pretended to? But so it is, And as much as Mr. *H.* commends the Queen and her Administration, if it could be supposed to happen that upon any turn of Affairs, he should apprehend the Queen and both Houses to enact any Laws that might be to the hurt and ruine of the People, (though themselves had another Notion of it, and designed ever so well in it) if he will be true to his own Principles, he is bound to Preach up Resistance against them. So that in this Case he declares open War, against both Queen and Parliament, if they do not order things, as he judges may be for the Benefit and Welfare of the Publick. For thus he speaks; * *should all who are possessed of Power, in any other Form of Government, [than that of an Absolute Monarchy] consent, and agree, to enslave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and to make them miserable; there is nothing in Nature, or in the Christian Religion, that can hinder the People from redressing their Grievances; and from answering the Will of Almighty God; so far as to preserve, and secure the Happiness of the Publick Society. Such is the tendency of his Doctrine, such the extent of his Resistance, and such the mighty regard he has for our Laws and Constitution.*

So that upon the whole, Mr. *H.* has not approved himself so very *cautious and prudent* in what he has Discoursed upon this Argument. For after all his Flourishes to the contrary, he is forced to own a Difference betwixt his Text and his Sermon; and it is plain this Difference remains yet vastly great, the One being in truth no less than a flat Contradiction to the Other. The Apostle forbids all Resisting the *Higher Powers* upon pain of *Damnation*; but Mr. *H.* allows to resist and depose them, whensoever they consent or agree to enslave the People committed to their Care, that is to say, when-

* Page 10, and again Page 38.

soever their Sovereign Lords the People shall conceive them to have thus *Agreed*. I should have been very glad if I could, according to Mr. H's. || desire, have shewn People that no such Doctrines can be built upon his Sermon, [I add, or Vindication] or receive any encouragement from them, or either of them. But the Reader sees by this time, it is not in my power; They are too plainly taught and encouraged in Both.

C H A P. VII.

Whether Mr. H. has faithfully expounded the Words of the Apostle; Rom. 13. 1, &c.

IN the next place Mr. H. proceeds to the Words of his Text, and summons all his Ingenuity and Skill to wrest them to a meaning, that himself acknowledges † to be different from what they seem to import, but in reality from what is the natural Importance of them. A true and genuine Paraphrase of them would not serve his Scheme; and since that must be right, whatever the Doctrine of the Apostle be, he sets himself with all his might, to fix a Sense upon his Text, which it never was intended to bear, nor is any more capable of, as I have observed already, than the Second Commandment is of allowing the Worship of Images in times of great Danger and Persecution, the Sixth of admitting of Murder upon a high Provocation, or the Seventh of Dispensing with Adultery, or at least with simple Fornication, when under a strong Temptation to it.

|| Page 40.

† Page 7.

When

When a Precept or Prohibition is delivered in as express and positive words as can be, and no Immorality, or natural Absurdity implied in the literal Sense of the Words, nor any Restriction in other parts of Scripture to limit it, if this be not to be taken in its full scope, and without Reservation or Exception, Mr. *H.* would do well to let us know, how we may be able to distinguish what Injunctions are really Universal and Unlimited, and which not, lest otherwise his way of Expounding open a wide door for Lewdness, Theft, Blasphemy, Murder, Idolatry, and all sorts of Impieties to enter in; which I take to be a matter that as well deserves his regard, as the temporal secular Interests of Publick Societies. However, let us see what he makes of the Words he has undertaken to explain. And so we shall find, that as the Author of *Popery Misrepresented and Represented*, set before his Reader a twofold Character of Popery, but both of them far from being a true Character of it, that so the unwary Reader might by this Artifice be the more easily won over to his side; So Mr. *H.* here undertakes a twofold Interpretation of the Seven first Verses of the Chapter; such as himself *thinks the only just and reasonable one*; and such as he is pleased to draw up for those of a contrary Opinion, *which in his judgment * they must give if they will be consistent with themselves*, but which he testifies for them that they have *never actually given*, and he may be sure they never will give; the one so very partial and forced, and the other so unlike what his Opposites would say for themselves, or can approve of, that I shall not trouble the Reader with the Repetition of them. But shall only make some few Observations on the former, and then subjoin such a plain Exposition of the Apostle's Words, as seems best to suit with the genuine and natural Design and Importance of them.

* Pref. Pag. XXXIII.

1. And in the first Place I observe, that Mr *H.* founds his whole Exposition upon a groundless Supposal, that this Command was entirely owing to a certain † Notion that had obtain'd amongst the *Jews*, that *no Subjection was due to Heathen Magistrates in the Execution of their Office.* He adds, that this same Notion remained even amongst those of them who were converted to the Christian Religion; and that to stop this pernicious Opinion, and remove the Scandal it might fix upon Christianity, the Apostle gave this Charge to all Christians. Yet has he not given any proof, either that the Apostle had any regard to this *Jewish* Notion, nor that the *Christians* did retain it; as he ought in common Prudence to have done, before he undertook to raise his whole Fabrick upon it: Nay, so diffident is he of this his first Principle, that he pretends to throw it off, as of *small Importance to his Interpretation.* And yet it is notorious, that not only his Comment upon the first Verse is purely built upon it, but moreover, *v. 6.* he repeats it again without any the least hesitation, as he does also upon other Occasions; as if it were a most undoubted truth, and himself had never intimated any the least distrust concerning it.

I have already observ'd, that this Epistle was directed || to all the Christians at *Rome*; and can it be thought the Apostle would, without taking any manner of Notice, or giving the least hint of it, accommodate himself to the particular case of the *Jews*, that were scattered amongst them, and probably were, as I have said, but a small part of them? And I appeal to Mr *H.* whether, upon farther Consideration, he can in his Conscience Sincerely, and *bonâ fide* believe it.

2. In his Paraphrase upon the first Verse, speaking of the Subjection due to Magistrates, he slides in these Words, as if they had been the Apostle's, *in the executi-*

† Page 41.

|| πᾶσι τοῖς ἔσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀγαπῶντες θεῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἀγίοις.
Ch. 1. v. 7.

on of their Office, and again, considered as Magistrates ; which was done meerly to serve his own Hypothesis, and make the Reader conceive these Restrictions to be in the Text. Whereas he knows very well there is not a word of either of these Passages there, but they are pure additions of his own inventing.

3. On the second Verse he again brings in, *in the execution of their Office* ; and for the same reason as before, tho' whether so *cautiously and prudently* as he may think, I would desire him to consider. For I am apt to believe, that both here and in the former Verse, they will reach farther than he intended them, or will pretend to justify the extent of them : For I cannot but think the Learned Mr Milbourn's Observation to be very just, || that this Exposition leaves the Prince liable to be resisted, *when he is diverting himself, or engaged in any private Business, which has no relation to the Publick Government.* And if he had added, *when asleep or sick upon his Bed,* I know not how Mr H. would answer it, seeing in neither of these Cases he is *in the execution of his Office*. Here likewise Mr H. varies from our Translation, in rendering the word *xpiam* Judgment ; but since he allows it to be *Judgment and due Punishment from God himself*, and * has before own'd it to mean *Damnation*, I shall have no difference with him about this.

4. Upon the third Verse I meet with a Passage, that to my Understanding, needs a little Explication. Where speaking of *Heathen Magistrates*, he gives this caution ; *You very much mistake the Business, if you look upon them as Enemies by their Office to what is truly Good and Praise-Worthy.* Which Words must mean, either that *Heathen Magistrates*, whilst they remain such, for this his own Words suppose when he calls them *Heathen Magistrates* ; they must mean, I say, that *Heathen Magistrates* remaining such, were by their Office, to promote Chri-

|| *Measures of Resistance*, p. 7.

* *Page 11, and 35.*

stianity by all means in their Power, as what would certainly have been most for the Advantage of their Society, that is to say, they were to act against their own Judgment, and set up what they believed a False Religion; which Mr *H.* will not say they ought to have done, whilst they continued of that Perswasion. Or else they were to promote and encourage what themselves thought to be good and Praise-worthy. And if this be all that is intended, Mr *H.* will not easily instance in any Prince whatsoever, who, tho' he may have done many extravagant and unjust things for his own Humour, has not yet in the main been an Encourager of what he apprehended to be for the advantage of his Dominions, whether really so or not. At least, this Doctrine will make a Prince to be irresistible, tho' he actually subvert the Laws and Constitution, and set up a new Form of Government, or a new Religion, so long as he conceives all this to be for the benefit of his Subjects. And what then becomes of ^{Mr} *H.*'s Doctrine of Resistance?

5. Mr *H.* at the 6th and 7th Pages of his Sermon, has found out an Interpretation for these Words, *You must needs be Subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake*, that one of less Ingenuity than himself would hardly have hit upon, *that is, It is your Duty to obey the Supreme Power, because the great End of all humane Authority is the Good of the Publick; that honest Men may be protected in their Properties, and all Violence and Disorder, and Unhappiness in humane Society be prevented and punished; and because it is your Duty to promote that good End.* This with Mr *H.* is to be Subject for Conscience sake. And here again to the same purpose, * he makes the Office of Magistrates to be the Ordinance of God, not be-

* Page 43, 44.

cause the *Higher Powers* are † ἐνδὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι, appointed by God as his *Ministers*, or as the Words will as well bear, appointed under God as his *Lieutenants*, his *Vice-gerents* and *Representatives*, his *Deputies* and *Viceroy*s; but only as it carries forward his *Designs in the World*. Which *Judas* did in betraying our *Blessed Lord*; and yet Mr *H.* will not say, he was ordained by God to do this great *Wickedness*: Yet for ought I see, Mr *H.* makes him in this place as much the *Ordinance of God*, as he will allow the most *Lawful Sovereign* to be.

6. The same thing he repeats in other Words upon the next Verse. But since he offers nothing new, the same Answer may serve here.

7. And again upon the last of his Seven Verses, he insists, That *Governors are clothed with Power for the good of Humane Society*, as if this were the only End of their Power. This he has affirm'd, and goes on constantly to affirm it; and tho' he has been told, that this is not the only, nor the main End of Submission to *Governors*, and tho' the Words of his Text are clear and full against him, he is still resolved not to quit his Point. He has imbib'd this false Notion, and it is so dear to him that he knows not how to part with it, whatever Evidence is brought against it. Thus much concerning Mr *H.*'s Paraphrase upon the Apostle's Words, which he gives out to be the only *Just and Reasonable One*; how justly and reasonably the Reader may see by this time.

Next follows that which he has drawn up for the *Adversaries of Resistance*, which he has endeavoured to make as ridiculous as he could, whereby to expose them

† Paulus nullum ait Imperium nunc contingere, nisi Deo auctoritatem ei suam dante, sicut Rex dat Præsidibus; quod ut rectius intelligatur, addit, omnia Imperia quæ sunt, i. e. quamdiu manent ac durant, à Deo constitui, i. e. auctoritatem suam accipere, non minus quàm si Reges illi per Prophetas uncti essent, ut quidam *Syriæ Reges*. M. Pol. in loc.

to the contempt of his injudicious and less considerate Readers. But this being not only what, as he owns, none of them have ever said, but what according to their Principles, it cannot be expected that any of them should say, I therefore pass it by, and proceed to shew what is the true meaning of these Words of the Apostle.

1. *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers; for there are no Powers but of God; and the Powers that be are ordained of God.*

1. Remember this is one necessary Branch of that Holy Doctrine our Blessed Saviour delivered to his Disciples, and to the Conscientious observance whereof

you are all indispensably obliged, that every one of you, * high or low, rich or poor, Lay or Clergy, all in whatever Station or Condition, must pay a constant Obedience to such Governors, whether Christians or Heathens, as it pleases God to set over you: For they are His Ministers and Representatives, and upon this account have a Right to your Allegiance; which must by no means be denied them by such as call themselves our Lord's Disciples, and hope to partake of his Salvation.

2. *Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

2. So that there is no resisting the Governors thus instituted by God, without at the same time resisting God who has instituted them, and has appointed

them to Rule in his stead, and by his Authority. And all that shall incur the guilt of such Resistance, do in a manner set themselves in Battel array against God; they resist his Ordinance, and for so doing shall, besides all Temporal Punishments in this World, be condemned to everlasting Torments in the next.

* Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. καὶ ἀπὸ
 σολῶν ἢ καὶ εὐαγγελιστῆς, καὶ περὶ τῆς, καὶ ὁσιουσιν. B.
 Chrysost. in loc.

3. For Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same.

are by Designation and Appointment, the Generality of them are in Fact and Reality, and the very worst, such as *Tiberius* and *Caligula*, *Claudius* and *Nero*, are in some measure, † a terror rather to evil than to well doers; the most outrageous Tyrants being less pernicious to any Nation or Kingdom, than a Liberty for every one to do that which is right in his own Eyes, as is usual where there is no King or other Supream Magistrate amongst them.

The Laws of all Nations are usually so contrived, as to encourage Virtue and Probity in the main, and to discountenance, condemn, and punish Vice. And no Princes and Governors are so bad, as that more are not benefited, than injured by them. Their own Interest, Safety, and Convenience call upon them to have a regard to the Welfare of their People; which they will not wholly neglect. And though they may do many things detrimental to it, yet ordinarily it may be observed that the likeliest way to be rewarded by Good Rulers, and to escape the better under the Bad, is to be careful of your Duty towards them; this being a sure way of recommending your selves to the former, and the readiest course you can take to mollifie and appease the latter, and thereby of preventing the Evils you might otherwise have met with.

|| Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ βαθεῖαν ἔδωκε τὴν πληγὴν, καὶ κατέπληξεν αὐτοὺς, πάλιν ἀνίσταν, ὥσπερ σοφὸς ἰατρὸς φάρμακα πρὸς πῆξις, &c. Id.

† Μεγάλως γὰρ ἐπερρεῖσιν ἡμᾶς οἱ ἄρχοντες, δι' αὐτῶν γὰρ ὁ βίβη ἡμῶν σωίσεται ὡς εἰ γε μὴ ἦσαν, πάντα ἂν ἔρχετο, ὥς δωατωτέραν τὰς ἀδυνεστέρων κατυπνόντων, δίκῃ ἰχθυῶν. Oecumen. in v. 5.

4. *For he is the Minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the Minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.*

they be, will hardly fail of turning to your own Advantage. As also on the other hand, he has the Sword committed to him by God, for the Punishment of Traitors, and Rebels, and other Malefactors, who must expect to suffer for their Offences; this being a necessary part of the Magistrate's Duty, and from which no bad Subject ought in any wise to think himself secure.

5. *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.*

Sense of Duty to Almighty God, whose Vicegerents Kings and other supreme Rulers are, as well as in order to their own present Safety, to pay them all Allegiance; and be so subject to them as to obey all their lawful and just Commands, and patiently submit to the Penalties that may follow upon the Non-observance of those which are unlawful; so as never to rise up against them, or use any violence and injustice towards them; but trust rather to God's good Providence and Protection, who will certainly cause * *all things to work together for good to them that love him*, whose Ordinance is slighted and affronted by Resistance, and who they may be sure will find out a way to punish them severely for it.

6. *For for this cause pay you tribute also; for they are God's Ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.*

4. For he [the Ruler] is appointed by God for the Subjects Good; and generally speaking he is so to a considerable degree. So that a good Behaviour, a prudent and quiet, submissive and dutiful Deportment in your several Stations, whatever

5. So that upon the whole it is evident, that all Subjects are bound in point of Conscience, and out of a

6. Upon this last Consideration of your being subject for Conscience sake, you are to pay Tribute like-

* Rom. 8. 28.

wife for the necessary support of the Government. You are to look upon Princes as God's Ministers, engaged in a Business, which they are forced to give great attendance to, and must therefore have due Supplies administered accordingly.

7. *Render therefore to all their dues; Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.*

7. Wherefore be ye always ready to render, as a Debt owing to them, all such Payments as are thus necessary for the Maintenance of their Government and

Authority; together with all that Honour and Reverence that belongs to their high Station, and the Power committed to them.

This is a plain and natural Exposition of the Words. And it is easie to see by it, how Mr. *H.* has been put to it to wrest them to an improper Sense, that he might make them suit with his Doctrine of Resistance. For hereby it appears there is not one word in the Apostle that encourages Opposition to Governours, but all is against it. And whereas Mr. *H.* makes a notion of the *Jews* to be the occasion of the Apostle's thus teaching the *Romans*, † *Oecumenius* gives another account of it. He observes how naturally this Injunction of Obedience to Authority follows upon the conclusion of the foregoing Chapter; in that as our Religion requires Love and Forgiveness of our Enemies, and a Forbearance to requite their ill turns, so does it more especially a due Regard and Submission to our Superiours, to whom, as such, all stand particularly engaged. And

† Ἐπειδὴ ἱκανῶς κατήρπισε τὰ ἥθη τῶν ἀκρόντων, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐχθροῖς εἶναι ἐυμενῆς, εἰσάγει καὶ παντὶ τῷ παρσίνεσιν, παιδεύων πᾶσαν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἱερεὺς καὶ μοναχὸς, καὶ Ἀπόστολος, ὑποτάσσεται τοῖς ἀρχαῖς.
Oecum. in v. 1.

S. || *Chrysostom* long before tells us, this is a Topick our Apostle insinuates much upon in others also of his Epistles, giving the Christians to understand that our Saviour did not design to exempt his followers from those natural Obligations Inferiours are under to their Superiours, but on the contrary *as he at other times requires Servants to be subject to their Masters, so does he here enjoin the same subjection to those in Power and Authority;* plainly implying that our Religion earnestly presses this Duty, and is so far from discharging Subjects from their former Obligations, that it lays a much stricter tye upon them, and makes all their Offences of this sort exceedingly more offensive and more dangerous, than they had been before. And one who had heard nothing of this Controversie could hardly avoid believing, that the bare reading the two first Verses of the Chapter, must eternally silence all pretences to the contrary, they are so expresse and positive against all Resistance.

However this is not enough to satisfy Mr. H. but he comes on anew, full flushed with a set of Arguments, that he seems to promise himself will do mighty execution, such as that the Doctrine of Non-resistance must inevitably fall before them. Wherefore that he may not complain, I have over-looked any thing he seems to lay a stress upon, I must spend a few Leaves upon these. And accordingly I design the consideration of them for the Business of the next Chapter.

|| Πολὺν τὸ πρὸς γμαλθ τέτε ποιῆται λόγον καὶ ἐν ἐπέροις ἐπιστολαῖς, καθάπερ τὸς οἰκέτας τοῖς δεσπόταις, ἔτω καὶ τὸς ἀρχομένους τοῖς ἀρχαῖς ὑποτάσσων. B. Chrysost. in loc.

C H A P. VIII.

Whether Mr. H's. several Arguments do sufficiently disprove the Doctrine of Non-Resistance ?

HERE I am to examine the several Arguments Mr. H. brings towards the latter end of his second Chapter, in vindication of his former Doctrine, against Passive Obedience and Non-resistance. And I shall do it as briefly as I can.

I. He argues, * in relation to *Nero*, most probably the Emperor at *Rome* when this Epistle was written. And here he pleads

1. That his *Personal Vices* will not affect this matter, unless they were such as rendered him a settled Enemy to the Publick Happiness. What he means by a settled Enemy to the Publick Happiness I know not. But this I know, that, if he did not attend perpetually to the business of his Government, watching continually for the Good and Happiness of humane Society, he stands condemned by Mr. H. himself, as not the Governor *S. Paul* means in this place, or to whom he here presses Obedience. This he tells us expressly *Pag. 21.* of his *Measures of Submission*. I know again, that so far as he Deflects from promoting the Publick Good, so far he is pronounced by the same Mr. H. to lose his Title to these Declarations of the Apostle, *Pag. 24.* Whether Mr. H. will allow him that goes thus far only to be a settled Enemy to the Publick Good, he has not told us; but I think he has plainly enough told us that he is resistible. And if *Nero's Personal Vices* carried him thus far, they will certainly affect this matter.

* Page 48.

2. If he were such a Magistrate as set himself to act contrary to the *End of his Office*, it is impossible says Mr. H. S. Paul should mean him particularly in this place. If by *meaning in particular*, he intend meaning him alone, I know none that pretends it; but if he intends him amongst others, this must be allowed (if he were then Emperor) till Mr. H. can prove the *Powers that be*, not to mean the Governors in being at that time. Besides, does Mr. H. think the Apostle designed in these words to teach Resistance of the Emperor then in being? If he does, he has a very peculiar way of thinking, and must excuse the rest of the World, if they cannot concur with him in so extravagant a Notion. If he does not think it, he must own the Emperor then being, how bad soever, to be the Power that was at that time to be owned at *Rome*, and to whom Subjection was to be paid through the Empire.

As to what the Apostle speaks of Rulers being a *Terror not to Good works, but to the Evil*, I have already considered it; and I do not think I am bound to repeat my Answer every time Mr. H. does his Objection.

3. Again says Mr. H. If the *Roman Emperor at this time* were guilty of any *Instances of Tyranny and Oppression*, and did in his general Behaviour consult the Publick Happiness, S. Paul's Reasoning here will not so much as make it a necessary part of Duty to submit to him in those *Instances of Tyranny and Oppression*. How does this agree with what is affirmed, but in the Page before, that *Those Vices which do not render him a settled Enemy to the Publick Happiness, will not affect this matter*? If this be not playing fast and loose, saying and unsaying, What is?

4. His Fourth Argument is, That Bishop Pearson fixes the time of the Writing this Epistle, in the Third Year of *Nero*. To which I answer,

1. All do not agree in this, and I hope Mr. H. will not make a moral Duty to depend entirely upon the uncertain Conjectures of Chronologers, how great soever.

2. Does Mr. *H.* believe in his Conscience that St. *Paul* would lay down a Precept, with design it should be observed only for two or three Years, or not rather for a Perpetuity?

3. Did *Nero* behave himself so well during his first Five Years as never to *deflect from the Will of God*, or be *guilty of any Instances of Tyranny and Oppression*? If he were not more circumspect than this comes to, this Observation according to Mr. *H.*'s. own Doctrine, will stand him in little stead. Yet * *Tacitus* relates of him, that in the Consulship of *Q. Volusius* and *P. Scipio*, which I take to be in the second Year of his Reign, he visited the *Stews* and other by-places, in disguise, attended with such as laid hold of what goods came in their way, falling upon and wounding those they met with in their rambles; both Men and Women of Quality being assaulted by them; hereby encouraging others to the like Disorders. Does not Mr. *H.* reckon this a *Deflecting from God's Will*? Or does he allow it to be *an attending continually upon this very thing*? If the former, then *Nero* upon his Principles was resistible in his *Quinquennium*, notwithstanding S. *Paul's* Prohibition of Resistance. If the latter, how shall we know when it is a Prince first becomes Resistible? Was *Nero* in this a *Terror to Evil works*? On the other hand, was it not *Profaneness and Blasphemy*, to say he acted by God's Authority in these Instances? How then could he be irresistible? Was this really promoting the Publick Good? If not, whatsoever Reputation he might have obtained for *Virtue, and Good Nature, and Generosity*, I have Mr. *H.*'s. Authority to tell him, † that he had lost his Title to these Declarations of the Apostle, which forbade to take up Arms against him; And again, that Acting in this manner contrary to the End of his Office, || it was impossible S. *Paul* should mean

* Annal. L. 13. P. 222.

† Page 24.

|| Page 48.

him particularly in this Place. And then I perswade myself Mr. H. must allow he might be resisted, for these Pranks; though he had not || entirely ruined the Happiness of the Society.

5. Mr. H. proceeds, *It doth not appear that the Form of Government was as yet so altered, as that the Roman Emperour was then absolute, and without controul by the Laws then in Force.*

1. If Mr. H. could make it out that Nero by the Laws of the Empire was accountable to the Senate, as the Kings of Sparta were to the Ephori, and as the Doge of Venice is now to their Senate, and the Kings of Poland to their Constituents, all that would follow from hence would be only that he was not the Higher Power, (* that is to say the Highest, for so the words certainly mean,) not that the Higher Power might be resisted, which is the Point he was to maintain.

2. Or if he could shew the Senate to be Sharers with him in the Government, yet this would not at all prove that both together being the Higher Powers were not irresistible. And it is only the irresistibility of the Higher Powers that I plead for, wheresoever or in whomsoever it be placed.

3 Mr. H's. saying, *It does not appear,* is no proof that Nero was not an Absolute Monarch; and yet unless he could have proved that, I see not of what use he could expect this Instance to be to him.

His Sixth Plea can signifie nothing at all, till he shall have first proved, what he began his Paraphrase with, but will never be able to prove, that the Notion of some of the Jews, concerning the Unlawfulness of obeying Governors who were not of their own Nation, was the occasion of S. Paul's giving this Precept for Submission to the Higher Powers.

7. In the next place Mr. *H.* affirms this Precept to be given only for the sake of those *who acknowledged no Submission due to Governors, in point of Conscience, from the End of their Institution, and the Usefulness of their Office,* quite dropping his Text, and the principal Ground of this Submission, that Governors are *the Ordinance of God,* and upon this account are not to be resisted. For so are the Apostle's Words, *Whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

8. Mr. *H.* is got to his *Jews* again, from whose Notion he collects, just with the same strength of Argument he has done several times before, that *considering what a handle was hereby given to misrepresent the Christian Religion as an Enemy to Government, S. Paul could not well say less upon this Subject than he here doth:* Whereto I answer, that as Mr. *H.* has not proved, nor ever can prove, that the Notion of the *Jews* concerning Obedience to Governors was the true cause of what the Apostle here enjoins, and so his Argument falls to the ground; so on the other hand, considering the Divine Institution of Government, the Apostle could not well say near so little here as Mr. *H.* would have him. He could not say less than that God's Minister, whosoever he be, must needs be irresistible, till it pleases his Supream Lord to remove him from his Station. Nor could he have avoided the scandalizing all the Princes in the World, and especially the *Roman* Emperor, and rendering our Religion a great Offence to them, if he had given Subjects free liberty to Rebel, or in Mr. *H.*'s Language to Resist any of them, so oft as they should see them *Deflecting from the Will of God,* and not so solicitous for promoting the *Publick Welfare and Happiness* as they ought to be.

9. *The Romans,* says Mr. *H.* *were the greatest Friends to Liberty, and to their own Rights even at this time,* and could not be supposed to bear such a Notion, as that they were left entirely at the Mercy of their Emperors. *The contrary is manifest from their general Abhorrence*

horrence of Nero, and their Defection from him, and the Senate's declaring him a Publick Enemy. And thus it seems according to Mr. H. the Christian Loyalty was to be adapted just to their Notions, and not carried a step higher than it was with that People. They had Stews too, amongst them for Lust, and Circes for Cruelty and Barbarity, and false Gods and their Temples for Idolatry; and is it not to all intents and purposes as good an Argument against the Apostle's condemning these, as against condemning Resistance, that the Romans would be offended at him for so doing? But his Office was not to favour their Errors or Vices of whatever sort, but plainly to lay the Will and Word of God before so many as would attend to it; and not be overawed by others, but leave the Event of all to Almighty God, * *whose he was, and whom he served.*

And yet whatever fear of Offending there might be, and so far as that might in any case be attended to, one would think there was much less Danger in Offending their Fellow-Subjects, than their Prince, who had it in his Power to exercise the utmost Severities upon the Christians, and upon Multitudes of them at once, as they oftentimes found to their Cost. Nor could the Apostles have taken a more probable Course to have themselves and their Religion together extirpated out of the World, than if by teaching, as Mr. H. does, the Doctrine of Resistance, they had set all the Princes upon Earth against them; and had at the same time forfeited all pretence to the Divine Protection, by Preaching up Rebellion against his Ordinance.

10. But Mr. H. is of Opinion, † that *this Doctrine of Non-resistance, though delivered in general terms by the Apostle, is not yet to be understood without Restriction.*

* Act. 27. 23.

† Page 53.

1. Because of *the great Absurdity of making the Christian Religion an Enemy to the happiness of Humane Society.* But what if this Doctrine of Non-resistance, be not such an Enemy to Humane Society, as Mr. *H.* supposes? Then this Argument falls to the Ground. Farther, what if the Prohibition of Resistance be really for the Benefit of Humane Society? I have seriously considered this matter, and think it were no difficult task at all to maintain that it is so. I also very well know, what Mr. *H.* has said against it, and could easily Answer any Argument I meet with in him, and shall effectually do it in what I have to offer toward the latter end of this Treatise. At present I choose rather to pass it by, and only refer the Reader to a few Pages in Dr. *Hickes's Jovian*, Ch. 11. P. 256, to the end of the Chapter, and to Dr. *Falkner's Christian Loyalty*, B. 2. Ch. 2. Sect. 3. P. 389, &c. in both which Learned Authors he will find such a brief account of the Mischiefs of Rebellion, as will need some farther answer, than has been yet given.

Whereto I only add, ^y Queen *Mary's* is justly complained of as the cruellest and most destructive Persecution that has been known in this Nation for many Ages. And yet as the Lord Bishop of *Sarum* observes from Mr. *Fox*, † the Number of the Martyred then were but 72, the first Year of this Persecution, 94 the second, 79 the next, and 39 the last; in all 284. A small number in comparison of what might be expected to fall in but one pitched Battel! Besides that when the Sword is once unsheathed, no one knows how many Battels may ensue, and what other outrages and devastations may be made before it be put up again. Not to say, that the Divine Blessing and Protection may far better be expected by such as suffer in Obedience to his Command, than by those that fight against it.

† Hist. of the Reformation, Part 2. Book 2. Page 364.

So that here is no such absurdity, as he *imagines*, whereby to limit this general Precept of the Apostle.

2. Because *the Reasoning of S. Paul in this place doth happily prevent this Objection*. Whereto I shall only rejoin, that the *Reasoning of S. Paul in this place does happily establish our Doctrine of Non-resistance*. For he not only commands Submission, but lays open the grounds on which it is due; and these grounds, as I have already observed, are such as manifestly infer the Necessity of Non-resistance in all Cases.

3. Because *the very Persons who blame all Restriction in this Place, where the Discourse of S. Paul himself makes it necessary, are obliged to allow Restrictions in many other Points, where there is no such express Reasoning to make it necessary*. Now if there be nothing in S. Paul's Reasoning to make this Restriction necessary, as I presume I have fully proved there is not, and the other places here appealed to are either not to be restrained, or the Restriction of them is manifestly taught in other places of Scripture, this Argument must necessarily fall to the Ground. And that this is the true state of the Case, a little inspection into the Texts alledged will sufficiently inform us.

1. The first is concerning *the Obedience of Children to Parents, and Servants to Masters*. Which though delivered in general terms, must be restrained by reason of the Obligation they are under to *obey God rather than Man*. According to which, these Expressions, how general soever, cannot possibly oblige to the observance of any Command they know to be unlawful. These words, as *Thomas Aquinas* * well observes, are to be understood to relate to those things *quæ pertinent ad jus patriæ vel dominativæ potestatis, which belong to the power of a Parent or Ruler*; He had noted a little before, that a Proconsul's Commands are of no force in opposition to those of the Emperor whose Minister he is. Which is a great truth; and such as makes it very

* 22^d q. 104. Art. 5.

plain, that the command of a Parent or Master is of little force against the Prohibition of Almighty God. But where is the Prohibition of Passive Obedience? It is not so much as pretended that Christians are any where in Scripture forbid to suffer wrongfully, or required to rise up in Arms against a Tyrannical Sovereign; which were absolutely necessary to make these Instances parallel.

2 His next Instance is in those Words of our Saviour, † *Swear not at all*, which considered in it self is certainly a general Prohibition. But if we attend to the occasion of it; and that in all probability it is levelled || not only against common Swearing in ordinary Conversation, but likewise against a custom that had obtained amongst the *Jews* of Swearing, by the Heavens, the Earth, *Jerusalem*, &c. as likewise that Swearing was used * before the Law, and † under the Law, and under the Gospel, || *S. Paul* swearing often, our blessed Saviour not † refusing to answer upon Adjuration, God himself || being represented as swearing, and * *an Oath for confirmation* being recommended as *the end of all Strife*, none can doubt whether this Prohibition be to be understood with restriction. But what affinity is there betwixt these words of our Lord, and those of the Apostle in the Text? Was resistance to Princes allowed of before and under the Law? Has God, our Blessed Saviour, or any of his Apostles, set an Example of it? Or is it any where recommended in Scripture? Sure *Mr. H.* had not considered at all, when he alledged these words as an Evidence of the lawfulness of Resistance.

† *S. Matt.* 5. 34. || *Ver.* 34, 35, 36.

* *Gen.* 21. 23, 24. and 24. 3, 4. and 31. 53. and again 47. 29, 30, 31.

† *Josh.* 9. 19. *Judg.* 21. 1, 7. *1 Sam.* 20. 41. *Psal.* 119. 106. *Deut.* 6. 13. and 10. 20. *Jer.* 4. 2. and divers other places.

|| *Rom.* 1. 9. and 9. 1. *2 Cor.* 1. 23. and 11. 31. *Gal.* 1. 20. *Phil.* 1. 8. and other places.

† *S. Matt.* 26. 63. || *Heb.* 6. 13. * *Ver.* 16.

3. His Third Instance is in that Advice of *S. Paul* to *Titus*, † to speak evil of no man. Concerning which I need not tell Mr. *H.* that in the Original it is *μηδὲνα βλασφημεῖν*, to slander and defame no man, || to blait no one's Reputation by an unjust charge upon him. And therefore I conclude, that if he consider this, he will not see any reason why these words may not be understood in their strict literal Sense. In short, this is the only true Parallel to his Text of all he has produced, because of them all these words, like that, undoubtedly need no restriction.

4. * *Pray without ceasing* is another of his Instances. Ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε. I believe Mr. *H.* will not be able to prove that these words import any more than those of our Lord, *S. Luke* 18. 1. that Men ought to pray always, or persevere in this Duty, and not to faint, or be discouraged, though they have not their Petitions immediately granted them; *μη' ἐκκακεῖν*, not to be weary of it, or backward to it. So the Word is used, *2 Thes.* 3. 13. And so says † *Budens*; or not to be tired and give over, so || *Hesychius*; or than those of the Apostle, *Rom.* 12. 12. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖντες, continuing instant in Prayer. And to this Text will need no restriction. Or if he can make it out, that the Words literally import an incessant attendance upon this Duty, I grant they must then be understood with restriction, not only because it is not lawful to pray always to the hindrance of other Duties, which interfere with such a constant attendance upon this, and yet are of such necessity as not to be omitted for the sake of it; but moreover because it is not possible to be continually engaged in this Duty, to the neglect of our necessary food, and other natural occasions, and the depriving us of our Sleep,

† Tit. 3. 2.

|| So the Etymology of the word imports, ἀπὸ τῆς βλάβης τὴν φήμην.

* 1 Thes. 5. 17.

† Μη' ἐκχάμωσιν, ne elasscant, ut *Plinius* dixit. Quod apud Apostolum ἐκκακεῖν legitur *Ephes.* 3. 10. μη' ἐκκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι.

|| ἐκκακεῖμεν, ἡμελεῖμεν, ἡκηδιώμεν.

without

without which we can no more subsist, than without our daily Food. And when Mr. *H.* can evince it alike unlawful and impossible to forbear Resisting the *Higher Powers*, I will own the case alike in both. Till then, I hope he will be more ingenuous than to insilt upon it.

5. A farther Instance to this purpose is in those words of the Apostle, * *Rejoyce evermore*. But Mr. *H.* knows very well, that the Scripture not only directs to *rejoyce evermore*, but to † *lament and weep, and mourn*; and that for this reason it is necessary so to interpret both these Precepts, as that they may consist with each other. But the same Scripture as I have already observed, has no where enjoined Subjects to resist their Sovereign, whereby to restrain this Command in the Text, *to be Subject to the Higher Powers*.

6. His next Instance is, || *Give to every one that asketh*. And to this I must answer, that when Mr. *H.* can shew this command as possible to be performed in its utmost extent, as it is to forbear all Resistance of our Superiors, I shall concur with him that his Text ought to be restrained as much as this; but it will be unreasonable to expect it till then.

7. There is but one Instance more to be considered, and that is * of our Saviour's forbidding to revenge our selves upon *Private Injurious Persons*. In which case saith he, *our Saviour himself hath laid down Non-resistance in more expresse and more absolute words, than either He, or any of his Apostles did with respect to Princes*. For answer whereto, the Reader may please to remember, it is *Grotius's* observation upon the place, that *to*

* 1 Thes. 5. 16.

† S. Jam. 4. 9.

|| S. Matt. 5. 42.

* S. Matt. 5. 39.

turn the cheek to the smiter, was a Proverbial saying amongst the Jews, and meant no more than *patiently to bear an affront or injury*, and this we all know is our Saviour's Doctrine, and to be practised by such as hope to be saved by him. But yet

1. I deny that *our Saviour has laid down* Non-resistance in *this Case* more expressly than Resistance of Princes is forbidden both by Himself and his Apostles.

2. I observe that the Instances our Saviour mentions, when he forbids to resist Evil, are such as a Man may comply with without any great damage; such are turning one Cheek when the other is smitten, and parting with a Cloak or a Coat; in which I see no such Absurdity, as that the Injunction may not be literally complied with.

3. In Assaults and Injuries of a higher Nature and greater Consequence, not only the Apostle allows to * *go to Law*, provided it be *before the Saints*, before whom, for the honour of Christianity. he would have it, rather than before the Heathen Tribunals, but our Lord himself intimates a Defence of our Lives and Livelihoods to be allowed to his Disciples. For I cannot apprehend to what other end he should advise, that *he who had no Sword, † should sell his garment and buy one*; nor what could be meant by that other saying of our Lord, || *that the Master of the Family would not have suffered his house to be broken through*. Let Mr. H. shew any such allowance for Resisting the *Higher Powers*, before he pretends this case to resemble that before us.

* 1 Cor. 6 1, 2.

† S. Luke 22. 36.

|| S. Luke 12. 39

4. If Mr. *H.* should urge farther that our Saviour speaks of the loss not only of a Garment, but of an Eye or a Tooth, and the loss of these, especially of the former of them is of greater Consequence, and so might call for a Reparation; to this I answer, that the loss of an Eye is great, but will not be one jot the less by a Retaliation in the same kind. And no wonder therefore if our Blessed Saviour has totally forbidden all proceedings of that nature, as not suiting with the kind and meek, patient and peaceable Spirit and Temper of the Gospel. But what is this to Mr. *H.*'s Doctrine of Resistance? Or what can he infer from hence to authorize the taking up of Arms against the Magistrate?

But more particularly,

1. *Non-resistance*, says Mr. *H.* in the case of Private Persons, is more absolutely laid down in the New Testament, than in the case of Princes. But I cannot find in what place of Scripture it is so.

2. He says, it is as much the Doctrine of the Cross as the other. Wheresoever it is so, no doubt it ought to be practised as much as the other. But where the Scripture allows a remedy in this case, and not in the other, it is not, nor can be equally the Doctrine of the Cross.

3. It is as Glorious and as becoming the Peaceable Temper of Christianity, as the other. But the present question is, whether it be in all cases as necessary as the other?

4. The Injurious Person is as much sent by the Providence of God for your Punishment, as the Injurious Prince. is placed upon the Throne for that purpose. See how this agrees with *Hosea* 13. 11. I gave thee a King in mine Anger.

Anger, meaning an Evil one, says our * *Homily against Wilful Rebellion*; and with *Isaiah* 10. 5. Where *Sennacherib* is called *the Rod of God's Anger*. After which Divine Declaration, † it is too much to say that such injurious Kings are no more set up by God's Providence, or sent for the Punishment of a wicked People, than ‖ a Highway-Man, or House-breaker, a Robber or a Cut-throat, or other like *Injurious Person*, is for the Punishment of Private Persons. Here is no more than a bare Permissive Providence; but if there were not more in the former case, it would be impossible to explain how the *Powers that be are ordained of God*.

Lastly, Says Mr. H. *It is not of so ill Consequence to recede from your own Right, and Liberty, and to let your self be ruined, as it is to give up the Rights and Liberties of your self, and Neighbours, and your whole Posterity.* The tendency of which Assertion is only to prove that Publick Submission is more highly prejudicial than bearing Private Injuries, not that *Non-resistance in the case of Private Persons, is more absolutely laid down in the New Testament than in the case of Princes.* And besides, it is built upon two Suppositions, both of them at best very doubtful and uncertain, and therefore by no means to be depended upon. For,

1. It supposes that not to resist a Tyrannical Prince, is to give up our *Rights and Liberties, and of our Neighbours, and our whole Posterity*; whereas when done in Obedience to God's Command, and because it cannot be avoided without Sin, to submit in this case, as I have noted before, is only to commit our selves to his Care and good Providence, which is the best Pro-

* Part 1st. Page 280.

† See Arch-Bishop Usher's *Power of the Prince*, Page 169, 170.

‖ Page 89, and 149.

tection we can hope for; in as much as he knows how to over-rule all Events to his own purposes, and has moreover passed his word, that he will make *all things*, and if all things, then our greatest Sufferings and Afflictions, to * *work together for the good of them that love God.*

2. It supposes Resistance an effectual means of securing our selves, our Neighbours, and our Posterity, against the Invasions of Tyrannical Governors. Whereas there is no just reason to expect this Event, but rather to fear that all our Attempts of this Nature, because unlawful, should have a contrary Effect, and conduce rather to our Slavery and Ruine; as it did here from the beginning of the long Rebellion, till the happy Restauration of King *Charles II.* and as it did likewise with the *Bohemians*, whom, when the Cruelties and Oppressions they laboured under, had provoked to Arms, they soon felt the dismal effect of them; for † *being subdued, the chief of their Nobility were some punished, and others put to flight, their Pastors were proscribed, and their People assaulted, some by Flatteries, and others by Terrors and ill Usage, to make them change their Religion; and in a little time their Nobles were all banished, and the Common People committed to Prisons and Tortures; till at length, they had not a Church left standing, nor a School, nor were allowed so much as the private Exercise of their Religion, or the use of their Bibles, or Books of Devotion.*

Thus I have gone through all Mr. *H's*. Scripture-Instances, for the Restriction of this Precept of the Apostle. And by this time I hope it fully appears that none of them come up to his purpose; but that this

* Rom. 8. 28.

† Eccles. Slavon. Histor. a Jo. Am. Commen. Edit. P. 58, 59.

Command to be *subject to the Higher Powers* remains yet as extensive and unrestrained, as if not one of them had ever been mentioned.

Yet after all, he is pleased to tell us, * *as far as he can see: there is not one Reason, which can be brought against Resistance to Publick Injuries, but what holds more strongly against Resistance to Private Injuries: But that many Reasons may be brought against Resistance to Private Injuries, which cannot hold in the other.*

I have told him of one Reason against *Publick Resistance*, the great Mischief that usually redounds thence to the Society; and I find I must again put him in mind of another and a greater, that it is a resisting *the Ordinance of God*, and a ready way to *Damnation*, which he cannot say of all Resistance upon Personal Injuries. He cannot say Resisting a Private Person is Resisting *the Ordinance of God*. And as little that any allowable course of Resisting such, is attended with the like dismal Consequence. The natural Result of which considerations is, that there is no compare between these two Cases, of Publick and Private Resistance; and all the Allowance which is made for the latter, does not at all plead a like liberty as to the Former.

4. A Fourth Argument produced by Mr. H. for restraining this Precept of the Apostle, is as little to the purpose as any thing he has yet said; and has been so fully answered already, that I need only to remind him of what he ought to have considered, had I not called upon him to do it before; as I have more than once: namely that God is to be obeyed rather *than* Man. † His Observation is, that *they who blame all Re-*

* Page 59.

† Page 59.

strictions and Limitations to this Place, when applied to the Non-resistance and Passive Obedience here taught, are forced themselves to apply Limitations to this very place of Scripture, with respect to the Active Obedience here taught. And || reason good; for let me ask with S. Peter and S. John, * *Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you [the Rulers and Magistrates] more than unto God, judge ye.* And let me withal desire Mr. H. to produce a like Authority for restraining the Passive Obedience required in his Text; or to forbear inferring from the Restriction of our Active Obedience, that That must be Restrained too, till he has done it; and then we shall have no more of these Pretences.

Mr. H. desires it may farther be considered, that this Passage of S. Paul relating as well to the Inferiour, as the Superiour Degree of Magistrates, if it follow from this Place that Resistance in any Case to the Supreme Magistrate is a damnable Sin, it will also follow that Resistance in any Case to the lowest Magistrate is a Damnable Sin. Mr. H. does well here to take it for granted, that these words relate as well to Inferiour as Supream Magistrates, because he can never prove it. † The Inferiour cannot be the Superiour, nor the Lowest Ma-

|| The Apostle says, *they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation; not they that do not obey.* Doubtless therefore there is a difference. I have always thought Passive Obedience to be a Medium or Christian Vertue between them; and surely so it is, unless Rebellion of late hath tane it from its place, made a vice of it, and clapt it into Prison. Symmons's *Loyal Subjects belief.* Section 9. Page 25.

* Act. 4. 19.

† Summa autem [n. potestas civilis] illa dicitur, cujus actus alterius juri non subsunt, ita ut alterius voluntatis humanæ arbitrio irriti possint reddi. Grot. de jur. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 3. Sect. 7.

gistrate .

gistrate the *Higher*, or *Highest Powers*, any more than a Petty Constable is a King or Emperor. And yet it is only of the *Highest Powers* upon the place, the ὑπερ-
 χουσι ἐξουσίαι, || that the Apostle speaks in this Place. So
 that this Relation of the Words to the *Lowest Magistrate*
 is none of the Apostle's Doctrine, but Mr. H's. own
 Imagination.

Mr H. observes farther in relation to S. Paul's be-
 haviour towards the *Magistrates* of Philippi, *Act. 16. 37.*
that if he had had Power enough, he would not have
endured their Injuries. And I confess I am of the same
 mind; but then I see no reason to imagine with Mr. H.
 that he would have taken up Arms against them, but
 only that by Appealing to some higher Court he
 would have got them punished for their irregular Pro-
 ceedings against himself and *Silas*, his fellow-Prisoner.
 This I am satisfied is the utmost Mr. H. can infer from
 this Observation; and if he can make any use of it
 for patronizing the Doctrine of Resistance, he may im-
 prove it to the best advantage he shall be able.

*Another of his Observations is, * that if S. Paul had*
intended, or plainly laid down such an Absolute Subjection,
and Non-resistance to Governors, as some have built
upon the 13th Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans,
and this before he was accused as a Pestilent Fellow, and
a mover of Sedition, Act. 24. 5. he could not possibly
have done more for his own Defence than to have appealed
to that Chapter, and Pleaded that he was an Enemy to
Sedition, &c. This is the Objection; but Mr. H. has
 been so kind as to save me the trouble of a Reply to

|| The same word that is rendered *Supreme*, 1 S. Pet.
 2. 13.

* Page 62.

it, for himself sufficiently answers it towards the bottom of the Page, by acquainting us with the tenor of his Accusation, which was that *he endeavoured to draw his Hearers off from the Observation of the Ceremonial Law, and that this was all the Sedition or Disturbance intended in this Accusation.* Which being so, I see not what reason the Apostle had to appeal to these words of his Epistle to the *Romans*; his proper business being to justify what he had taught amongst the *Jews* his Accusers, not to go off to another Argument, which how true soever, had yet no relation to the Point they were then upon.

He adds another Observation *by the way*, which he might every whit as well have let alone, for any service it will do Him, or his Cause; however I must take notice of it, that he may not complain of a neglect. And it is this, *He seems by his Appealing to Rome for Judgment in his Case, to have been pretty well satisfied that the Course of Publick Justice was not yet so interrupted and disturbed, but that he might yet have all the Right allowed him that a Roman could claim.* The natural Consequence of which is, that how bad soever *Nero* were in himself, yet so long as he had those under him who took care to see Justice administered, so that an Appellant might have all the Right done him that he could desire, there was no just ground for taking up Arms against him, even upon Mr *H.*'s own Principle. And if *Nero* were not to be resisted, very few other Princes can have deserved it.

One thing † more Mr. *H.* observes, that *what S. Paul has delivered in this Chapter, concerning the Duty of Subjects, is not barely by way of Precept,*

† Page 92.

or Command only, as He hath done in many other Cases, but by way of Reasoning, or inferring one thing from another. So say I too. He adds that this will help mightily to secure the true Sense of the Place. In which I concur with him likewise. So that, says he, in order to prove that I have mistaken or misrepresented S. Paul, it will not be sufficient to say, that he condemns Resistance, and presseth Subjection; for so, says Mr H. do I; and so he certainly does, if pleading for Resistance with all his might, be to condemn Resistance, and to press Subjection. But it must be shewn, as he proceeds, that his Reasoning concludes against the Resistance which I have taught to be lawful. So that here by his own confession, condemning Resistance, is teaching it to be lawful: But this, as I have observed, is Mr H's. way of condemning. Yet this is not all; for it must be farther shewn, that the Apostle necessarily inferrs such a Passive Submission, as Mr H. has denied to follow from it; and that this Passage can admit of no Restrictions, though numberless other Passages of the New Testament necessarily require them. Both which Points I hope I have fully cleared to the Satisfaction of the honest and impartial Reader. For I have proved that the Apostle does infer from the Magistrate's being God's Ordinance, &c. such a Submissive Passive Obedience as Mr. H. has been zealously labouring to extirpate; and that not only this Passage does admit of no Restriction, but all the other Places he has cited out of the New Testament for restraining it, leave it yet as free and unrestrained as it was before.

Thus I have gone through the first Part of my Undertaking, which was to shew that Mr H. has not proved the truth of his Doctrine of Resistance: And from what I have written it is easie to observe, that he has neither given us a true account of the Apostle's Doctrine in his Text, nor really established the

the lawfulness of Resisting the higher Powers in any case, nor so much as laid down a true Criterion whereby even according to his own Doctrine Subjects might know when it is lawful for them to fly to Arms, or what steps must necessarily have been taken by their Superiours, before they might warrantably apply themselves to this method for redress of their Grievances, if his Doctrine had been true; Besides that he bids defiance to the Parliament, no less than the Queen, by teaching both from the * Pulpit, and from the † Press, that *should all who are possessed of Power, in any Form of Government, consent, and agree, to enslave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and to make them Miserable, || there is nothing in Nature, or in the Christian Religion, that can hinder the People from redressing their Grievances, and from answering the Will of Almighty God, so far as to preserve, and secure the Happiness of the Publick Society.*

The natural Consequence of which Doctrine is, that if the Bill against *Occasional Conformity* had formerly gone on as was intended, which one Part

* Page 10.

† Page 38.

|| So also in the Preface to his *Original and Institution of Civil Government Discussed*, p. xi. Is not *Universal Misery and Ruine*, the same, whether it comes from the hands of *Many*, or of *One*? Would not the *Unhappiness* of this *Nation*, in particular, have been the same, whether a *Late King* alone, or by the help of a *formal Law*, had subjected it to the *Religion of Rome*, and the *Maxims of France*? &c.

of the Nation would have been sure to complain of as a Hardship upon them ; or at present if the Party now laid aside should dislike the Proceedings of the next Parliament, and should conclude them to tend to the Prejudice and Damage of the People, and a likely means of making them miserable, they are at Liberty to raise a Commotion in the Nation, and try if they can by Force regain their former Places of Honour, and Advantage, and Power, in order to their own and the Nation's Safety. And so here is a delicate Scheme laid for Rebellion, whensoever an Opportunity shall offer it self. Especially since such as may be inclined to it will presently contrive him to recommend it, as a noble, a glorious and honourable Undertaking, to free themselves and their Adherents from the Losses, the Neglect, and other Inconveniencies, they might otherwise come to labour under, and perhaps their Posterity in succeeding Generations.

This too many will easily persuade themselves to have been his meaning, in telling them * that *Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society, over which they are placed : it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governours.*

Mr. H. proceeds at large to answer divers Objections against his Doctrine ; most of which I shall entirely pass over, as not pertinent to my present purpose. But before he does this, he professes † to

* Page 40.

† Page 65.

set down the Doctrine he has taught, and then the Doctrine contrary to it, whereby to set off his own to the better Advantage. Both these I shall subjoin here, and then shall conclude this First Part, with a Third, which I promise my self the Reader will find to be a truer and by much a juster state of the Case than either of them.

His own Doctrine, he tells us, may be comprised in this one following Proposition, in the words just now mentioned; Supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by Opposing and Resisting such Governours.

This is Mr. H's. Doctrine, in his own Words; and if this be false, the contrary, as he justly observes must be true. This he undertakes to set down therefore in the following Words; Supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the end of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is not Lawful for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governours. But it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, to suffer patiently all their Oppressions, and to let the Happiness of Humane Society be entirely Ruined at their Will and Pleasure.

In both these Propositions Mr. H. entirely sets aside not only the Doctrine of his Text, but the good Providence of God, and the gracious Promises of Protection he has made to those that cast their care upon him, and suffer patiently and christianly for his sake. Nor is there a Word in either of them that in the
least

least favours of Christianity, or might not have much better become a professed Heathen, than a Disciple of our Blessed Lord and Saviour; or a meer Politician, than a Preacher of the Gospel.

Therefore if he please to give me leave, I will offer at another Proposition, which perhaps may set the Question we are upon in a better light; but which I am sure suits much better with the Precepts of the Gospel, and that Dependance we all ought to have upon Almighty God, in our greatest Exigences, and when under our most dismal Fears or Sufferings.

It is this; *Supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the End of their Institution, and in all respects as ill as Mr. H. supposes; as it is not safe for their Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governours, lest they thereby provoke Almighty God to bring upon them a much sorer Destruction than what they thus endeavour to stave off; So on the other hand it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, patiently to suffer all their Oppressions, as the Primitive Martyrs and Confessors did, as Christian Subjects, and Disciples of Christ, wholly referring their Cause, and resigning themselves to God's good Pleasure; either to be delivered in his due time, or if he shall have otherwise determined concerning them, resolutely and chearfully, faithfully and submissively, to bear what ever he shall, in his infinite Wisdom, see fit to lay upon them, in a firm and full assurance of an Abundant Recompence in a future State, when their light Afflictions, and which were comparatively but for a moment, shall have wrought out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory.*

The

The sum of all is, that it is much safer and better, more laudable and glorious, more dutiful and Christian, to rely wholly upon that Good Providence, which Mr. *H.* has left entirely out of the Controversie, than upon the Resistance he is so zealous an Advocate for.

The End of the First Part.

**BOOKS Sold by W. Taylor, at the Ship
in Pater-noster-Row.**

SERMONS on several Subjects, &c.

Vol. VIII. Holiness the Great Design of the Gospel Dispensation.

Christ's Life a Pattern of Holiness to Christians.

The Holiness of Christians ought to be Eminent.

The Holiness of Christians ought to be Conspicuous.

The Wisdom of being Holy.

The Advantage of being Holy.

The Pleasure of being Holy.

The Exemplary Holiness of the Primitive Christians.

Christ's Grace sufficient to make Christians Holy.

Vol. IX. The Nature, Extent, and Polity of God's Kingdom on Earth.

God's Omnipresence the best Guard against Sin.

Perpetual Rejoycing the Duty of Christians.

All things to be done to the Glory of God.

All things to be done in the Name of Christ.

The Meditation of God's Love the Good Man's Delight.

The Vanity of Hearing the Word of God without Doing it.

The Duty and Advantage of seeking Spiritual Things.

The Sinfulness and Mischief of Worldly Anxiety.

The Great Duty and Happiness of Loving God, &c.

Vol. X. The Easiness of Christ's Yoke.

The Christian Race.

Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Christ a Saviour before his Incarnation.

The Presence of Christ in the Religious Assemblies of Christians.

The

The Way of seeking God so as to find him.

The Way of pleasing God.

The Parable of the Sower.

The Blessing of Purity in Heart.

Against Rash Swearing.

A *Spiritual* Sermon, on 1 *Tim.* 6. 17.

Obedience to Governours.

All three by the Right Reverend Father in God, *Will. Beveridge*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of *St. Asaph*. Printed from his Original Manuscripts.

Demonstratio de Deo ; sive Methodus ad Cognitionem Dei Naturalem, brevis ac demonstrativa. Cui accedunt Epistola quaedam miscellanea ; de Animæ Natura & Immortalitate, de Veritate Religionis Christianæ, de Universo, &c. Authore Josepho Raphson, A. M. & Reg. Soc. Socio.

An University Oration concerning the different Fates of the Christian Religion, spoken in the Publick Act of the University of *Geneva* the 11th Day of *May*, 1708. In which the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy is asserted, Separation on the account of Ceremony is condemn'd, and an universal Conformity of the Protestant Churches to the ancient Discipline and Worship is wish'd for. By *John Alphonfus Turretin*, Pastor, Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History, and Deputy Rector of the University. The Second Edition. To which is added, Dr. *Nicholls's* Thanks to Mr. *Turretin* ; Written by Order of the Society for Propagation of Religion, for his Oration of the different Fates, dedicated to them.

A Bridle for the Tongue, under these following Heads; *viz.* Of prophane Atheistical Discourse, of Blasphemy, of rash and vain Swearing, of False-accusing, or bearing False-witness, of Calumny or Slander, of Detraction, or Backbiting, and of Tale-bearing and Reproof, of Censoriousness, or rash Judging, of Scoffing, Derision or Mocking, of Contumely or Reproach, of Imprecation or Cursing, of Brawling, Quarrelling, or Wrangling, of Dissimulation or Deceit, of Flattery, of Lying, Equivocation, Promise-breaking, and Discovering Secrets, of Talkativeness, Garrulity, or vain Babbling, of Ostentation, or Boasting, of Querulousness or Murmuring, of foolish Jesting, of obscene and immodest Talk. By *Henry Hooton*, M. A.

Mr. HOADLY's
MEASURES of SUBMISSION
TO THE
Civil Magistrate
Enquired into, and Disproved.

PART. II.

Wherein is shewn,
That the RESISTANCE Mr. HOADLY has
taught is contrary to Scripture, and to the Doctrines
and Practices of the Primitive Christians, to the Do-
ctrine of our own Church, and the Laws of the Land;
and moreover that it is not so necessary in order to
the Welfare of Mankind, as he seems to imagine.

By a Presbyterian of the Church of England.

When I consider how expressly Christ forbids his Disciples to resist Evil, Matt. 5. 39. how severely that Resistance is condemned by S. Paul, and that Condemnation is declared the Punishment of it, I am forced to cry out, Oh! what Times have we fallen in, in which Men dare, against the express Laws of the Gospel, defend that Practice upon which God hath passed this Condemnation? If whosoever break the least of these commandments, and teach men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of God; what shall their Portion be, who teach Men to break one of the greatest of these Commandments, such as are the Laws of Peace and Subjection? And what may we not look for from such Teachers, who dare tax that glorious Doctrine of patient Suffering, as brutish and irrational; and though it be expressly said, 1 S. Pet. 2. 21. That Christ by suffering for us, left us an example, how to follow his steps? Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland, By GILBERT BURNET, Professor of Theology in Glasgow, now the Lord Bishop of SARUM; p. 17, 18.

LONDON: Printed for W. Freeman at the Bible near Chancery Lane, Fleetstreet, and R. Wilkin at the King's-Head in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1712.

T H E
P R E F A C E,

MR. HOADLY in the beginning of his third Chapter professes, to set down the Doctrine he had taught, and the Doctrine contrary to it, that so the Reader might the better judge of both, and might the more easily see, on which side the Truth lies. His own Doctrine he comprises in this Proposition, *Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society, over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.* This he delivers as the Substance and Epitome of his own Doctrine. And to support it he argues, *That if this Proposition be false, the contrary must be true.* Which therefore he sets down thus.

The Preface.

Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society, over which they are placed; it is not Lawful for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governors. But it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, to suffer patiently all their Oppressions, and let the Happiness of Human Society be entirely ruined at their Will and Pleasure. And this latter Proposition he thinks should seem so absurd to all Persons of Understanding, as to be rejected, if any thing ought to be so, without farther Examination. Hence in the Conclusion of the former part of this Discourse, I thought it proper to give the Reader another view of this Controversy, by setting it in a truer Light, and which far better deserves the Attention of a Christian, whose *Conversation* ought to be continually in *Heaven*, and whom our Blessed Saviour teaches to seek first the *Kingdom of God and his Righteousness*, as of infinitely more important Concern to him, than all the greatest Temporal Safety and Welfare, and who ought to be mindful, that had Resistance been the best means of promoting our present Happiness, which is more than Mr. *Hoadly* will ever be able to prove, yet were this by no means to be set in competition with the Rewards or Punish-

The Preface.

Punishments of the other World. Thus therefore say I,

Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and in all respects as ill as Mr. Hoadly supposes; as it is not safe for their Subjects to oppose and resist such Governors, lest they thereby provoke Almighty God to bring upon them a far heavier Destruction, than what they thus endeavour to stave off; so on the other hand it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, patiently to suffer all their Oppressions, as the Primitive Martyrs and Confessors did, and as Christian Subjects, and the Disciples of Christ ought to do, wholly referring their Cause and resigning themselves to God's good Pleasure, either to be delivered in his due time, or if he shall have otherwise determined concerning them; resolutely and chearfully, faithfully and submissively to bear, whatever He shall in his infinite Wisdom see fit to lay upon them; in a firm and full Assurance of an abundant Recompence in a future State, when their light Afflictions, which were comparatively but for a Moment, shall have wrought out for them a far more exceeding and eternal Weight of Glory. And now that I may proceed in Mr. H.'s own method, I add, If this Proposition be false, the contrary must be true; which therefore I shall here set down.

The Preface.

make all good Christians exceedingly more desirous *to lay up to themselves Treasures in Heaven*, though with the loss of all they had esteemed most highly here, and even of their Lives if called to it, than forfeit their eternal Welfare for the sake of the utmost Happiness this World can possibly afford.

So that every one must needs see, that it would have been much more becoming Mr. H.'s Character, who himself owns (a) *that he was to act the part of a Divine*, to have really done so; to call upon People to look forward to another State, and make it their chief care to provide for that, than to put them upon consulting their temporal Safety, if Resistance can in any sense be said to be a consulting that, in direct defiance to his Text, and the Doctrine of that Religion whereof he is a Preacher. And barely thus changing the State of the Question, and putting it upon its true foot, shews plainly that Mr. H.'s way of arguing is dangerous, and consists rather in an artful turn of Words, than any true and solid Reasoning. Inasmuch as do but once apply the Case of Resistance to the Doctrine of the Gospel and the Hopes of another Life, and the Fear of that heavy *Damnation* the Apostle has annexed to it, and it has immediately a very different Face, from what it had, when applied only to the

(a) Measures of Submission. p. 112.

The Preface.

the present Safety and Happiness of ourselves, and the Community whereto we appertain.

I am persuaded any impartial Person may easily be satisfied, by what has been said in the former part of this Discourse, of the Unlawfulness of the *Resistance Mr. H. has taught*. But yet to make it more plain and evident, I have undertaken a farther Consideration of it, to shew its Inconsistency with either Christianity, or the Laws of the Land; which I confess has swelled to somewhat a larger Bulk than I intended, but yet I hope is not larger than the Argument I am treating of required. And if the Reader find it to his satisfaction, and that I have really performed what I undertook, I shall not be sorry that I have been at more Pains to serve him, than I had at first proposed to myself.

All I have farther to add, is only to entreat the Reader's Pardon that this second Part has not sooner followed the other, as it ought to have done; and as it should have done, being ready for the Press before the last Term, but that it could not be got printed time enough to be published then.

T H E

THE CONTENTS.

THE Introduction. p. i. The Design of the Whole. p. 2.

CHAP. I.

Whether Mr. H.'s Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to Scripture? p. 3. *The Testimony of Scripture is against it.* ibid. *The Titles given to Sovereign Princes therein.* p. 4. *Prohibitions of Resistance in the Old Testament.* ibid. *And in the New.* p. 7. *Mr. H.'s Exceptions to these considered.* p. 11.

CHAP. II.

Whether Mr. H.'s Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians? p. 37.

SECT. I. *What the Doctrine of the Primitive Christians was, as to the Duty of Obedience to Governors.* p. 39. *This shewn from the Constitutions called Apostolical.* p. 40. *From S. Ignatius.* p. 41. *From Justin M.* ibid. *From Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, and S. Polycarp.* p. 42. *From S. Irenæus.* p. 43. *From Tertullian.* p. 44. *From Origen.* p. 46. *From S. Cyprian.* p. 47. *From Marinus, and Theodotus.* p. 50. *From Dionysius of Alexandria.* p. 51.
From

The Contents.

From Laſtantiuſ, and Gregory Nazianzen. p. 52.
From S. Ambroſe. p. 53. From Gregory Nyſ-
ſen. p. 54. From S. Jerome, and Optatus. p. 55.
From S. Auguſtin. p. 56. From S. Chryſo-
ſtom. p. 57.

SECT. II. *What the Practice of the Primitive
Chriſtians was, in the point of Obedience to Go-
vernors. p. 62. They prayed for their preſent
Governors. p. 63. They readily ſubmitted to
the hardeſt Uſage they met with from them. p. 66.
And tho' it were againſt Law. p. 71. As was
uſual in many Caſes. p. 74. They bore their ma-
ny Hardſhips with a wonderful Calmneſs and Sub-
miſſion. p. 93. And this when well able to have
defended themſelves. p. 100. And when they
did not want ſuch as would have headed them in
an Inſurrection. p. 108.*

SECT. III. *What Obligation we are all under,
to the Imitation of theſe devout and heavenly-
minded Chriſtians. p. 112. In what Senſe they
underſtood the Doctrines of the Scriptures, &c to
the Caſe of Reſiſtance. p. 113. What indispen-
ſable Obligation they thought themſelves under to
behave themſelves accordingly. p. 116. How we
are all bound to follow their Example herein.
p. 119.*

SECT. IV. *What Mr. H. has offered in answer
to this Argument conſidered. p. 125.*

CHAP. III.

*What the Doctrine of our own Church is, in rela-
tion to this Principle of Non-reſiſtance. p. 172.
This ſhewn from the Doctrines of ſeveral of our
Biſhops, and other Divines. p. 173. And from
the Doctrine of the Homilies. p. 188. Mr. H.'s
Replies conſidered. p. 201.*

CHAP.

The Contents.

CH A P. IV.

Whether Mr. H.'s Doctrine be consistent with our own Municipal Laws? p. 211. No countenance given to it by these Laws. p. 212. But on the contrary, They declare the Supremacy to be solely in the King. p. 214. That all Allegiance is due to Him alone. p. 222. That he has the sole Power of the Militia. p. 223. That all Resistance of him is High Treason. p. 230. And condemn all Coercion of him. p. 231. And all Conspiring or Imagining his Death. p. 233. Mr. H.'s Pretences to the contrary answered. p. 234.

CH A P. V.

Whether a patient Submission and Non-resistance be not preferable to Resistance upon divers Accounts? p. 245. It is more pleasing to Almighty God. p. 246. It is more becoming our holy Profession. p. 247. It is a likelier method of preserving and propagating our Religion. p. 252. It is a surer course for obtaining eternal Happiness hereafter. p. 258. And is not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the generality of the World are apt to imagine. p. 259. The Conclusion of the Whole. p. 263. The LETTER concerning the Homilies.

Mr.

Mr. Hoadly's

MEASURES of SUBMISSION

TO THE

CIVIL MAGISTRATE

Enquired into, and Disproved.

PART. II.

The Introduction.

THOUGH it were answer enough to Mr. Hoadly, to have shewn the Weakness of his Arguments, and that after all the Applause his celebrated Performance has met with, upon a little Examination, it appears to fall very short, of proving the Lawfulness of that RESISTANCE it is so celebrated for; yet the more effectually to establish that truly Christian Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, which he has so industriously set himself to overthrow, I propounded in the second place, and accordingly now proceed, *To evince the Groundlesness and Falsity of his Doctrine*, and that as he has not yet been able to Prove it, so neither is it in itself capable of Proof.

B

This

This must necessarily be acknowledged to be true, supposing he has neither Scripture, Reason, nor Antiquity of his side. But if not only these do not bear testimony to his Doctrine, but are directly opposite to it ; and if moreover it be condemned by our own Church, and the Laws of our Civil Constitution, and in divers respects tends to the apparent Damage and Destruction of all that shall embrace it, I know not what more can be desired, to detect the Falseness and Absurdity of it. Wherefore to let the Reader see, that this is the true State of the Case, I shall now set myself to maintain these following Charges, against the *Resistance* Mr. *H.* has undertaken to vindicate : That it is contrary,

1. To Scripture.

2. To the Sentiments of the ancient Church.

3. To the Doctrine of our own Church, and its most eminent Divines, who have generally taught and maintained the contrary.

4. To the Laws of the Land.

5. And in the fifth and last place, That a patient Submission and Non-resistance is preferable to it upon divers accounts, as more pleasing to Almighty God, more becoming our Holy Profession, a far likelier method of preserving our Religion, and a surer course for obtaining eternal Happiness hereafter ; and withal is not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the generality of the World are too apt to imagine. Each of these Charges, if well made out, must necessarily be a powerful Argument against all Resistance of the *Higher Powers* ; but all of them together will leave those utterly inexcusable, who resolve not to be convinced by such abundant Evidence. These therefore I design for the Subject of the remaining part of this Discourse ; and in treating of them, I shall also take notice of whatever I think most material, in Mr. *H.*'s Answers to the Objections already produced against him.

C H A P. I.

Whether Mr. H's. Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to Scripture?

THAT Mr. H. has no Foundation for this Doctrine in Scripture, I have shewn already. And from what has been said, it is easy to observe moreover, That this Doctrine is not only not taught in Scripture, but is highly condemned by it as false and erroneous, and contrary to the Divine Will. Though I have yet said but little more upon that Subject, than what was barely needful, for vindicating the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, from Mr. H's misinterpretation of them, and to let his Admirers see, that our Blessed Lord and his Apostles have not established the Doctrine of Resistance, as Mr. H. would have them thought to have done.

Wherefore to prove this the more effectually, I am now to produce the Testimony of Scripture against him, and shew what declared Enemies both the Old and New Testament are to his darling *Measures of Submission*.

And one would think, that whosoever deliberately attends to what is there written, should soon be satisfied, without any nice unnecessary Enquiries, on which side of the Question the Truth lies. For the Duty of Submission to Authority indefinitely, and without restriction only to good Princes, and who duly attend to the end of their Institution, is not so obscurely taught there, as to need any Study, or Learning, or diligent Search for the discovery of it. And if it appear otherwise to any, it can be only to such, whose Understanding is byassed by the power of Prejudice or Interest, or that have been chiefly, if not only, conversant in such Authors, as have purposely set themselves to start needless and unaccountable Difficulties, whereby to perplex and obscure it, and prepossess Peoples Minds, and indispose them for the reception of it.

B

For

For besides that, the Scripture stiles Sovereign Princes (a) the *Lord's Anointed*, his (b) *Ministers*, his (c) *Chosen*; and even his own Name is put upon them, and they are called by no meaner a Title than that of the Gods; (d) *I have said ye are Gods, and ye are all the children of the Most High*: And before this, (e) *Thou shalt not revile the Gods*: Which we may assure our selves was not done casually, and without design, but to raise our Esteem of them, and beget in all Subjects the greater Reverence and Veneration for them, and make every one tremble at the thoughts of depressing those, *whom the Almighty King of Heaven and Earth thus delights to honour*;

Besides this, let any one read in the Old Testament such Prohibitions as these; (f) *Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse the Ruler of thy people*. (g) *Curse not the King, no not in thy thought*; and *curse not the Rich, the great Men, and such as are in subordinate Authority, in thy Bed-Chamber*: And for this reason, That as God himself knows all thy most secret Offences, and whatsoever Wickedness of this nature lurks privately in thy Heart, so he will not suffer it to lie concealed, but by some unexpected means or other it shall come to light; *For a Bird of the Air shall carry the voice, and that which hath Wings shall tell the matter*.

Let him observe the fifth Commandment, requiring to (h) *Honour our Father and our Mother*; which Divines have generally understood to relate to the Civil, no less than to the Spiritual, and to the Natural Parent.

Let him weigh well the Direction given by Samuel to the *Israelites*, (i) upon their request for a King to rule over them, that they might be governed as their Neighbours round about them were. There first, (k) he tells them how ill they had done in desiring another King, when the Lord himself was their Sovereign, and governed them
by

(a) 1 Sam. 2. 10. and 12. 3. and 24. 6. and many other places. (b) Rom. 13. 4. (c) Psal. 89. 3. and 106. 23. (d) Psal. 82. 6. (e) Exod. 22. 28. (f) Ibid. (g) Ecclef. 10. 20. (h) Exod. 20. 12. (i) 1 Sam. 8. 5. (k) v. 6. &c.

by his own more immediate Orders; and how highly he resented this their Petition, and how sorely he was displeased at it. (a) *They have not rejected Thee, says God, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.* Then he proceeds to acquaint them, what they were like to get by their change; That their Sons, their Daughters, their Servants and their Cattle, should be taken from them; their Nobles and Freemen should be made Slaves, and employed in mean and servile Offices; and their Goods and Possessions, their Fields, and Vineyards, and Oliveyards should be extorted from them, and given to his Officers and Servants. (b) *This will be the manner of the King that shall reign over you: He will take your Sons, and appoint them for himself, for his Chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your Daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his Officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants. And last of all, he prescribes the course they were to take under these Pressures; namely, To make their Complaint to Almighty God, and sue to him for relief. They must expect to lose their Children, their Estates, their Liberty, their Servants, their Cattle, and to be made a Prey, not only to the King but to his Ministers too, his Servants and Officers. And a King that rules thus tyrannically, I dare say Mr. H. will not own to attend continually to the good End of his Institution. Yet when reduced to this sad condition, the Prophet does not teach them, as Mr. H. would have done, to take up*

(a) 1 Sam. 8. 7.

(b) v. 11, &c.

Arms in their own Defence, against such a merciless Invader of their Rights. He does not instruct them, that then would be a proper time for them to shake off their Yoke, to rise against such an imperious domineering Prince, and depose and kill him: Does not recommend it as *glorious and honourable* to rid themselves of so unagreeable a Governor, as no longer fit to be endured. On the contrary, the only proper course he could direct them to, for the redress of such their Grievances, was, as I said, to refer themselves and their Cause to God, *the King of Kings and Lord of Lords*: (a) *Ye shall cry in that day, because of your King, which ye shall have chosen you, and the Lord will not hear you in that day.* Their King would be very hard upon them, and Almighty God would not hearken to their Cry, when they should implore his Protection in the day of their Calamity, which made their Case still abundantly the worse. And yet how intolerable soever their Oppressions were, the Prophet does not in the least intimate any other Remedy allowed them, besides that of Tears and Prayers; not a word of Resisting so arbitrary and tyrannical a King. All the comfort he gives them is only this, That they should cry because of their King which they had chosen; but should not be heard. As if he had said, How unagreeable soever this Usage will be to you, and though you think your Case ever so deplorable, yet may you not rise up against your King, to shake off his heavy Yoke by Force and Violence. You shall only cry to God for relief; and yet neither will he presently deliver you. However, though he do not, you are only to cry to him; no other Weapons being allowed you, in relation to your Sovereign Lord the King.

Let that Counsel of Solomon be attended to, (b) *לִשְׁמֹרֶת פִּי הַמֶּלֶךְ* To observe the mouth of the King; that is, as we have it in our Translation, *To keep the King's commandment,* and that in regard of the Oath of God. In regard, says (c) Bishop Parick; (or because of the matter) *of the Oath to which God is a Witneß, and a severe Revenger* of

(a) 1 Sam. 8. 18.

(b) Eccles. 8. 2.

(c) In loc.

of the breach of it. And again, (a) *My son, fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change; or, as it is in the Version of the Seventy Two, μὴ δ' ἰσέσῃ αὐτῶν ἀπειθήσας, Be disobedient to neither of them.*

Let it farther be observed, what a Character the same wise Solomon gives of a King; That he is one (b) *against whom there is no Rising up; that is, says the famous Bochart, (c) Against whom none of his Subjects ought to rise; and though many do it, this is always done against Law and Right; That (d) Where his Word is, there is Power; and (e) That none may say unto him, What dost thou? None may call him to an Account for his Doings, he having no superiour but God alone.*

Then let a Man cast his Eye upon the New Testament, and observe our Blessed Lord, not only requiring to (f) *Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's; and owning (g) Pilate's Power, his Authority, and Dominion to be (h) given him from Above, even when he was about to pass the most abominable and most execrable Judgment, that ever was given in the World; but likewise sharply rebuking St. Peter, for drawing his Sword without Commission, though in Defence of the Son of God, and Saviour of the World, saying unto him, (i) Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword, that is, of their own Heads, and when not entrusted with it by any Lawful Authority, shall perish with the sword.*

Let him look forward to the Apostle St. Paul, and see him (k) *Enjoining every soul to be subject to the Higher*

B 4

Powers

(a) Prov. 24. 21.

(b) Prov. 30. 31.

(c) Epist. p. 41. & Phaleg. Par. 2. l. 1. c. 16.

(d) Ecclef. 8. 4.

(e) Ibid.

(f) St. Mat. 22. 21.

(g) St. John 19. 11.

(h) *If we consider who Pilate was, namely, the Roman Governor sent to them by Cesar, (the Supreme) we have most plain Testimony, that however wicked Supreme Powers may be, or however wickedly they may use their Power, yet is their Power given them by God, and none may invade it, or take upon him to exercise it, but as they shall impart, or delegate it. Lord Bishop of Cork's Christian Law of the Sword, p. 12.*

(i) St. Mat. 26. 52.

(k) Rom. 13. 1, 2.

Powers, assuring us *there is no power but of God*; and the *Powers that be*, though such as *Claudius* and *Nero*, and others of the *Roman Emperors*, are *Ordained of God*: And for this reason, *whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation, as the just Reward of their Disobedience.*

Let him hearken to the same Apostle, declaring the Necessity of (a) *Subjection*; and not only for *Wrath*, (b) or while People are too weak to defend themselves, but also for *Conscience sake*, and even when they are strong enough in all appearance to make head against the *Higher Powers*, with a probable expectation of Success; and again admonishing *Titus* to warn those, committed to his Care, of their Duty in this respect, by (c) *putting them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*, Magistrates indefinitely, without confining such their Subjection to good Princes more than to the Bad, to the most diligent and tenderest of Governors, than to the cruellest of their Persecutors; and ~~and~~ lastly exhorting *Timothy* to see, (d) *That Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made, as for all Men, so in a particular manner for Kings, and all that are in authority*: Which suits not well with fighting against them; and especially if what follows be attended to, namely, *Not that we may be enabled to correct and bring them to Reason, if they govern amiss, but that under them we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all Godliness and Honesty.*

Let him see how *St. Peter* teaches, To (e) *submit ourselves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake*, and not barely for the sake of Publick Peace, and the happiness of Society; *whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governors under him, such as the Proconsuls, Procurators, Deputies, and other Superiours of distant Colonies, as to those that are commissioned and sent by him* for

(a) Rom. 13. 5.

(b) Milbourn's *Measures of Resistance*, p. 22.

(c) Tit. 3. 1. (d) 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. (e) 1 St. Pet. 2. 13, 14.

for the punishment of Evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well ; and how a little after he enjoins (a) To fear God and honour the King ; and again a little after that, propounds our blessed Saviour as a Pattern for our imitation, in a patient and quiet Submission to the sharpest and most barbarous Usage ; (b) Because Christ also hath suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should tread in his steps ; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth ; who when he was reviled, reviled not again ; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously ; who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, and not for his own but for our sakes, that we being dead to sin, might live unto righteousness ; by whose stripes we are healed ; and who upon this account might justly require and expect from us, that we be ready to suffer after his Example, whensoever God in his wise Providence sees fit to call us to it.

Let him weigh with himself those Words of the Apostle St. James, (c) *κατέδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε ἃ δίκαιον*, ye have condemned, ye have slain the Just, whether many righteous Persons, the Singular being put for the Plural, as (d) *Estius* conceives, *ἐκ ἀντιστάσεως ὑμῶν*, and he doth not (for they do not) resist you ; or else ἃ δίκαιον that righteous Person to whom this Epithet peculiarly belongs, our ever blessed Saviour, as (d) *Oecumenius*, *ἐκ ἀντιστάσεως*, the Present for the Perfect Tense, after the manner of the *Hebrews*, he did not resist you, as *Grotius* (d) understands the place. Let him, I say, weigh the Words in either of these Senses, and try if he can any way prove it lawful, to take a quite contrary course, when under Persecutions and Sufferings.

Let him proceed farther to St. Jude, and observe what a Mark that Apostle sets upon such as (e) *despise Dominions, and speak evil of Dignities*, though without ever arming themselves against them ; which were a much higher, and a far more offensive degree of Wickedness.

Once

(a) 1 Pet. 2. 17.

(b) v. 21, 22, 23, 24.

(c) ch. 5. 6.

(d) In loc.

(e) v. 8.

Once more let him recollect in the last place, and duly weigh with himself, that from the beginning of the Bible to the end of it, there is not one Direction for forcible Resistance of our Lawful Superiors, under whatsoever Pressures and ill Treatment, not one Instance ever recommended to our imitation, nor so much as any the least hint of the Lawfulness of such Proceedings; that we find a great deal in Scripture against them, but not one word any where in favour of them.

And then let him seriously and deliberately consider with himself, if any farther Condemnation of Resistance could be thought needful, supposing Almighty God had undoubtedly designed to prohibit it in all cases; and if it be not very surprizing, that any, who call themselves our Lord's Ambassadors, should act so diametrically opposite to their Office, as to set up for the Defence and Encouragement of it, as it were in open defiance to that holy Word of God, which they are sent to publish. A little Reflection upon the several Texts here recited, in favour of Kings, and the Honour and Reverence, Submission and Obedience due to them, will easily suggest the Necessity of paying them all Duty and Allegiance; Actively, wherever we can do it safely and with a good Conscience, and Passively where we cannot do it otherwise.

And to set up a Plea for *Resistance in some cases*, where the Scripture admits of none, were no better than to prefer our own vain Imaginations, before the undoubted Word of God, which has plainly required our Subjection and Obedience to Governors, but has made no provision for any Violence to be offered them, upon whatsoever account.

If this be not enough to evince the Obligation of a Duty thus taught, it will be impossible to prove we are obliged to any Duty at all. Since none can appear with greater advantage than this, of being enjoined over and over, and under the severest Penalties, and moreover without any manner of Restriction or Limitation, from the beginning of *Genesis* to the end of the *Revelation*.

Yet Mr. *H.* persuades himself he has found out something in most of these places of Scripture, by virtue whereof it will be lawful, and even *glorious* and *honourable*, for him to resist his Sovereign, whensoever he shall think it necessary. But with what Success, will soon appear, from a brief Inspection into the several Exceptions made by him to these Scripture-Evidences against Resistance.

I. He says, (a) If it be forbidden to curse or speak evil of the King, it is no less, to do the like to inferior Persons. But then he has neither shewn, why Kings are singled out from others, and the Cursing of them particularly forbidden, unless this were a greater Crime than Cursing an inferior Person; nor has he proved taking up Arms against our Sovereign to be a less Fault than Cursing him; though he cannot but know, that without such Proof there is no sort of Argument in his Observation.

However he proceeds, *Nor did any one ever infer from thence, that we ought not to think those Men Sinners, who are notoriously and apparently so.* Which is very true, but not at all to the purpose; the Question not being whether it is a Sin to think a wicked King to be a bad Man, or a bad Governor, but only whether it is lawful to Curse and Resist him as such? Of which here is not the least word.

But this is not all; For *much less*, says he, may we infer from hence, *that all their Wickedness may go unpunished, and uncontrouled.* True again! Nor can Mr. *H.* instance in any, who ever inferred from hence, that Malefactors might not be justly and legally punished for their Crimes. But it will by no means follow, that because disorderly Subjects may, and ought to be proceeded against according to Law, and by those who are sufficiently empowered to do it, therefore tyrannical Sovereigns may be punished too, without all Law, and by such as have no Authority over them, nor are any way empowered to proceed against them.

But it seems he has found out an Attempt of some of the

the ancient Christians, whom he does not name; but I take it for granted he means the Carriage (a) of the *Antiochians* towards *Julian* the Apostate; and not of (b) the Christians only, but of the People in general, whether Christians or Heathens; nor of the whole People neither, but of some of the Wits amongst them, of whom *Gregory Nazianzen* relates, That they called the Emperor *Idolianus*, and *Pisæus*, and *Adoneus*, and *Causitaurus*, from his Worship of Idols, the Honour he paid to *Jupiter* at *Pisa*, his great Reverence for *Adonis*; and the many Bulls he offered in Sacrifice, as (c) *Elias Eretensis* observes. And not only with respect to Religion, and the opposition *Julian* made against it, but upon account of the Scarcity of Provisions, occasioned by his Edicts, and his disallowing their Theatres and Plays. They were, as *Ammianus Marcellinus* relates, (d) a luxurious People, lovers of the Theatres, and of plentiful and delicious Fare, to which finding *Julian* an enemy, they hereupon took occasion to lampoon him. And does Mr. H. think this a reason for Subjects contempt to their Prince, and abuse of him, only because he is averse to the gratifying of their vicious and sinful Inclinations? If not, I hope it may still be affirmed of the Christians in general, that they were a submissive, passive body of Men, though some of the People of *Antioch*, who were not so much as in Pretence, and others of them who did not deserve the Name of Christians, behaved themselves indecently and undutifully towards *Julian*. They used (e) his Successor *Jovian* too in the same rude manner, a virtuous Prince, and a Patron, Protector and Encourager of the Christians. And broke down (f) *Theodosius's* Statues, not as if he were an ill Emperor, but because they were a disorderly, ungovernable, ill sort of People. Yet these Excesses, not so much as of one City, but only of some of the more facetious and
for-

(a) *Greg. Naz. Inveſt.* 3. p. 81.

(b) See *Jovian*, chap. III. p. 99.

(c) *In Orat.* 3. n. 74. p. 338. D.

(d) *Jovian*, p. 100, 101, 102, 103, 104.

(e) *Ibid.*

(f) *B. Chryſoſt.* Ἀνδραγόρων, α', β'.

forward, and the more licentious in it, he thinks enough to stop the Mouths of *such as make frequent Appeals* to the Primitive Christians in this Cause; and they must never more deny, that *Princes may be lashed with inimitable Severity*, because a few of the Inhabitants of *Antioch* once took too much liberty this way. And this must go for an undoubted Proof, that it is lawful to curse Princes upon occasion, though at the same time we very well know, the Holy Scripture has expressly forbidden it.

Again, *We are forbid*, says he, *to curse the King, and the like*, but this doth not forbid us to maintain our own Rights. What, by violent and forcible Opposition? This wants still to be proved, such a Resistance being abundantly more to the Prince's Hurt, than any of our Curses can be supposed to be. And it is not imaginable, that Almighty God would forbid the less, and yet allow the far greater and more dangerous Opposition.

Nor could Solomon, says he again, be supposed to put the Case of an unjust oppressing Tyrant, or to lay an Obligation upon Men, to think well of such; which is impossible. And whoever said, these Words implied an Impossibility? Yet I hope a Man might be forbid to curse or speak evil of, or do evil to any Man, how impossible soever it be to have a good Opinion of him. Which is all I would have inferred from this Admonition of the wise Man.

II. As for those Texts in which it is declared, that against a King there is no rising up, and that none may say unto him *What dost thou?* He affirms (a) that they are sufficiently explained, and their full Intent answered, (for any thing that can be made appear to the contrary) by applying them to such Kings, as act the part of Kings, and are the Ministers of publick Justice, and Peace to a Nation. And this, when he very well knows, there is not a tittle in the Words to restrain them only to good Kings, nor any thing more to be said for it, but only that it suits
with

with his Scheme, and rather than that should be spoiled, it must be so. And this Mr. *H.* is so sensible of, that he immediately goes off to another Interpretation; namely, *That Kings are possessed of such Power, that it is a foolish thing for private Persons to provoke them, or contend with them.* And yet he has not, and cannot shew, that private Persons are mentioned here, any more than those who are more publick, or than whole Communities; nor is it any way intimated, that these may rise up against their Prince, any more than private Persons. Which yet were necessary to make his Plea of any force. He has not proved, nor ever will be able to do it, that no more is meant by these Words, than that it is dangerous at present to rise in Arms against a Prince; which I readily assent to no less than himself, and take it to be one good Argument for that quiet Submission I am pleading for. But how does it any way appear, that there is no rising against a King upon this account only, and that we are not to forbear it as a Sin? The Apostle St. Paul requires to be subject not only for wrath, but for conscience sake. And this certainly is the much firmer, and more invincible Bar to Resistance. And Mr. *H.* has said nothing that does in the least evince the contrary to have been intended here.

However, he has made a farther and wonderful Discovery, *Whatever, says he, was intended in this Passage, there can be no such thing inferred from it, as that no Person may ever reprove, or check, or advise a Prince.* Now suppose this, does it hence follow that we may take up Arms against them? Which is what Mr. *H.* would be at, but what he will never know how to reconcile to this Text. *But this, says he again, is as much against the Letter of such Texts as any Opposition can be.* This I confess I cannot apprehend. And yet if it were so, I do not see of what advantage it would be to Mr. *H.* or his Cause, it being enough for my purpose, that such a Procedure is not against the natural and most obvious Sense of these Texts, and in which any Reader, of but a common and unbiassed Apprehension, will be sure to understand them.

III. As to what follows, in relation to *those Texts, which in general Expressions command to honour the King; and keep his Commandments, necessarily requiring a limitation*, I need only to refer the Reader to what I have already said, in the last Chapter of the former Part of this Discourse.

IV. The same I say likewise concerning what he repeats about the Necessity of *Active Obedience in all cases, as much as of Passive*; which having fully answered before, I need add no more of it here.

V. To our Lord's Command, (a) *to give Cesar the things that are Cesar's*, he answers, *That our Lord commands to give Kings their due; and to this all the World agree; but withal, that notwithstanding any thing in this Precept, we are left to judge what are the things that are Cesar's*. But then I hope, where the Rights of Princes are settled by the Laws of the Constitution, we must judge not by our own Fancies, but according to those Laws. And more particularly in our own Nation, if our Laws declare the Prince to be irresistible, as I shall shew beyond Contradiction in its proper place, these Words enforce the paying that Due, as well as others. Which is all the use that was designed to be made of them.

VI. He farther argues, *That (b) our Lord's forbidding his Disciples to resist those, (c) who came unjustly to apprehend and murder him, doth not necessarily infer any thing, but that his Design in coming into the World being to lay down his Life voluntarily for the good of Mankind, and the proper time of doing it being now come, their Resistance and Opposition was not at all proper and convenient*. And this I deny not to be the Sense of v. 53, 54. *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?* Yet even in this case, the learned Dr. Hammond's Note is worthy of Observation, *That (d) as Christ was decreed to that Death and Non-resistance, so are Christians, if St. Paul may be believed,*

(a) p. 124.

(b) Ibid.

(c) St. Mat. 26.

(d) *Of resisting the Lawful Magistrate, &c.* p. 304.

lieved, predestinated to be conformed to the Image of his Son, *Rom. 8.* that is, to that Pattern of his Suffering, not fighting, for Religion. And that Revelation of God's Will in the Decree being supposed, it will follow, that though Christ might lawfully have done otherwise, yet we Christians now may not; especially being commanded to learn of him, particularly his Meekness; 1. e. especially that Lamb-like quality of the Lamb of God in his Sufferings, *Is. 53. 7.*

But this is not the whole of our Saviour's Reproof of St. Peter, nor is it any part of what was alledged against Mr. H. as he very well knows. The Argument against him is taken from *v. 52. Put up again thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the Sword.* As if our Saviour should have said, (a) They who take the Sword, without any lawful Commission empowering them to make use of it, shall perish by the Sword; not prophetically, that this shall always be the certain and undoubted event of such Disloyalty, but meritoriously, as being what it always deserves, and very often meets with accordingly. Such are guilty of Murder in the sight of God, and have thereby a right to the Punishment of it, which is to fall by the Sword of Justice. This is a plain and obvious Sense of the Words; and such as that Mr. H. has but one Exception to it, and that such as will stand him in very little stead. Our Saviour, says Mr. H. (b) it being his Resolution not to call in the Assistance which he could command, might well require his Disciples to cease their fruitless Endeavours; and put them in mind that by their Resistance in this Cause, they would only endanger their own Lives, but not secure his, which he was now determined voluntarily to give up. But Mr. H. if he shall please to look once more upon the Words, may easily see there is nothing in them to limit them only to St. Peter and his company, or to that present Juncture, and that they are delivered in such general indefinite Terms, as to be rather a standing Rule

(a) Ille gladium accipit, qui nullà superiori ac legitimà potestate jubente vel concedente, in sanguinem alicujus armatur. *Gratian. in Jus Can. Caus. 23. Qu. 4. Ille gladium.*

(b) p. 125.

Rule for all Subjects, at all Times, and in all Places; cautioning them of both the Sin and Danger of taking up Arms against their lawful Superiours. That they are to be understood in this extent, may justly be inferred from the manner of Expression our Saviour uses, not suiting his Denunciation to the particular Case of *St. Peter*, in relation to whom he would most probably have said, *If thou takest the Sword, &c.* nor that of the Disciples alone, for then he would have needed only to change the Number, not the Person he spake in; but of all Mankind, so as to be a lasting Direction to all that should come after, as well as to themselves. For he expresses himself without any Reserve, in as universal Terms as may be; *All they that, whosoever now or at any other time, take the Sword, shall perish by the Sword.* Which the late *Dr. Sherlock*, with very good Reason, (a) affirms to be as expressly spoken against Resistance as may be. And *Mr. H.* may easily learn from it, that it is a great Truth which he denies, when he denies our Saviour (b) to have founded his *Non-resistance* upon the *Unlawfulness of the contrary*. And till he shall own himself convinced of this, I would entreat him to try, how he can answer the present Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*, asserting, in direct Contradiction to what is here suggested, (c) That *the only thing that can be imagined, to have been capable of fixing so severe a Censure upon St. Peter's Action, must have been this; That the Persons against whom he drew his Sword were the Ministers, and commissioned by a legal Authority to take our Blessed Saviour; and that being such, they were not to be resisted in the Execution of their Office; with more to the same purpose.* And a little after, speaking of defending Religion by force of Arms, (d) This, says his Lordship, *I take to be clear and certain, That had we no other Passage of Holy Scripture to convince us of the Falseness of such a Pretension, No Directions of any ancient Writers to inform us what the Duty*
C of

(a) *Case of Resistance*, ch. 2. p. 59.

(b) p. 125.

(c) *Sermon before the House of Lords*, Jan. 30. 1707. p. 8. in 8vo.

(d) *Ibid.* p. 10.

of a Christian in times of Persecution is, No Examples of Antiquity to shew us what his Behaviour ought to be; this single Passage, and Example, alone, might suffice to assure us, how directly contrary such a Principle must be, both to the Practice of our Saviour and the Rule of his Gospel.

But Mr. H. is resolved to be very obliging, and to allow the most that can be inferred from this Passage; only it unhappily falls out, that his Inference is quite wrong. His Words are these, *It will only follow from hence, that our Lord thought fit to submit in his own private Case to Injustice and Oppression. This, as he proceeds, I never argued against. But I think it hard to infer from hence, that it was his Will, that whole Nations should submit themselves, and their Posterity, to be ruined at the Will of cruel and unjust Governors. As if Mr. H. should have said; First, All they, must necessarily mean, not all that take the Sword upon whatsoever occasion, as the Words most plainly import, nor indeed any but S. Peter and they that joined with him: And again, secondly, Private Christians are obliged to conform themselves to our Blessed Saviour's Pattern, who left us an Example of patient Suffering, that we should tread in his Steps, but whole Nations of his Disciples are not. Which manifestly supposes our Saviour, to have given one sort of Laws to his Disciples as Men and Christians, and another quite contrary to these same Persons as Members of Society. Which Mr. H. may think as long as he pleases, but it is as far from Truth as any thing in the World can be. But let us attend to what follows.*

VII. *Our Blessed Lord's Declaration, says Mr. H. (a) That Pilate could have had no Power against him, unless it had been given him from above, is, I think as foreign to this purpose, as any thing that can well be imagined. This shews Mr. H. is not infallible: for if he will please to think again, he may possibly find it not so far from the purpose as he imagines. I am sure he has said nothing that will prove it to be so. Nor can he; for our Saviour here owns Pilate's Right of Judging to be from God,*

God, and that he is set to act as God's Minister; and if he would so grossly abuse the Power thus entrusted with him, as, for whatsoever secular end, to pass a Sentence of Condemnation upon the most Righteous Person in the World, the dearly beloved Son of God, our Saviour's (a) Submission in such a case, and his acknowledgment of the Power by which he was condemned, though most unjustly, whatever Mr. H. may think, is not at all foreign from his purpose, of teaching his Disciples a quiet Submission to the ill Treatment of their lawful, but cruel and unjust Governors.

Knowest thou not, says *Pilate* to our Saviour, *that I have* (b) *power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee?* To which Question had Mr. H. been to return Answer, and would he have done it consonantly to his own Principles, he must have told *Pilate*, not only that Crucifying the Lord of Life was a most abominable Wickedness, and at the least thought of which every Joint of him ought to tremble, and the utmost Horror and Astonishment to seize his Mind, as is most true; but moreover that by such an outrageous Attempt, he would lose all pretence to his wonted Authority, and all his Subjects would thenceforward be at liberty to look upon him as a Tyrant, and rise up against him, and expel him the Nation, and shew him no Pity or Humanity, because he did not act as became a good Governor, but was become a *Terrour to good Works*, not *to the Evil*, and so not only had justly forfeited, but had actually divested himself of all Right to govern any longer, and not only the Emperor, but the People might take him to task for it, whenever they pleased. This must have been Mr. H's. Reply. But does our Blessed Saviour make any such Return? Nothing like it; but on the contrary, he puts him in mind that he ought by no means to abuse the Power wherewith he was entrusted, inasmuch as it

C 2

was

(a) S. James 5. 6.

(b) Not δύναμις, but ἐξουσία. Ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σαυρώσαι σε, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολύσαι σε. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ὅουκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν δεμίαν κατ' ἐμῆ, εἰ μὴ ἢν σοὶ δεδομένη· γὰρ ἀνθρώπην. S. John 19. 10, 11.

was derived from God Almighty, the sole Fountain of all Power; and by whom alone it is that Kings, and Princes, and their inferiour Magistrates, are commissioned to decree Justice. *Thou couldst have no Power against me, except it were given thee from above.*

And this Answer is the more remarkable, because it implies the Emperor *Tiberius*, by whose mediation this Commission descended to *Pilate*, to reign by God's Authority. I hope Mr. *H.* will not commend him as an excellent Governor, as one who in the strictest Sense *did not bear the Sword in vain*, and was *a Terror not to good Works, but to the Evil*. The Historians who write of that time give a very different account of him, complaining (a) of his Remisness in Government, his (b) Licentiousness and extravagant Lusts, his (c) Covetousness, and (d) Parsimony, his (e) Greediness and Rapine, his (f) Cruelty towards his Friends and nearest Relations, and his (g) insatiable Barbarity towards others; yet however our Saviour acknowledges him, with all his Faults, to have the supreme Authority still residing in him, and that his Commission to *Pilate* was valid, and conveyed to him a Power of Life and Death. Otherwise our Saviour could not have owned *Pilate* to have his Power and Authority from God; as he most unquestionably does. And if two such ill Governors as these did, one immediately, and the other at a farther distance, derive their Authority from God, I cannot conceive but that Mr. *H.* upon a review of this *Declaration of our Lord*, must allow it to be not only not so foreign as he imagines, but very pat and pertinent to the case in hand, and that it is a very proper Argument for proving the Unlawfulness of Resisting a wicked, unjust,

(a) Eutrop. l. 7. Suet. vit. Tib. c. 38, 41.

(b) Suet. c. 42, 43, 44, 45. Eutrop. l. 7. Tacit. Annal. l. 6. ab initio. (c) Suet. c. 46. Eutrop. l. 7.

(d) Suet. c. 47, 48. (e) C. 49.

(f) Id. c. 52, 53, 54, 55. Tacit. Annal. l. 6. p. 153.

(g) Suet. c. 61, 62. Eutrop. l. 7. Tacit. Ann. l. 1. p. 6. l. 4. p. 106. l. 6. p. 152, 159. Dion. & Ziph. in Tiber.

unjust, tyrannical Governor, if God at any time shall see fit for our Sins to set such an one over us.

VIII. Thus Mr. *H.* proceeds in relation to his Text ; (a) *Of that celebrated Passage, Rom. 13. 1, 2, &c. I have, I hope, given a full and satisfactory account in the foregoing Chapter ; and have nothing farther to add. Which is all he says in this place. But upon another occasion he boasts of plain and full Evidence from it, as if there remained now no Pretence for doubting, whether he had not cleared it beyond all Contradiction. I have on my side, says he, (b) a positive Argument, drawn from the Character given by S. Paul himself, of those Higher Powers and Rulers of whom he is speaking ; and therefore may justly expect something at least as positive, taken from S. Paul's own Expression, to invalidate the force of this. But I find I may wait long enough, before I receive this Satisfaction. By this one would think these Words of S. Paul to be indisputably on Mr. H's side, and that the Apostle were very positive, as positive as Mr. H. can desire, for Resistance upon occasion. And yet let him read over these seven Verses five hundred times, to use his own Expression, (c) and see if he can find one word there in behalf of it, or can make out that the Apostle ever teaches the Lawfulness of it, or invites, or encourages, or so much as gives any the least countenance to it. Nothing is more plain, than that he most expressly forbids it, and under pain of Damnation, and requires the contrary not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake ; but not the least hint appears in defence of Resistance upon whatever account, as permitted to Christians. Let Mr. H. reflect upon this, and then judge who do most honour the Apostle ; they who only declare what they find expressly spoken by him, or they who will not allow him to speak any thing fit for an Apostle to say, or indeed who will not admit of what he does undoubtedly say, any farther than it suits with their own preconceived Notions and Hypotheses. How must this way of arguing reflect at last upon the Apostle him-*

(a) P. 127, (b) *Against Dr. Atterbury*, p. 19.
 (c) *Answer to Dr. Att.* p. 45.

himself, that he must not be allowed to say what he has said, and yet at the same time must be charged with having said, what he never did, or could say? *Unhappy Apostle!* (to use Mr. H's. own manner of Expression still) *not to know his own design, nor to prosecute it in a better method!* that he should principally mean to condemn all Resistance of the Higher Powers, as utterly unlawful, and yet argue in such a manner, as if it were lawful to resist a bad Governor! or else according to Mr. H's Scheme, that he intended to press Obedience only to good Rulers, and yet at the same time took occasion to forbid resisting any Governors whatsoever; and particularly such as were at that time, though far enough from being such as to whom alone Mr. H. will grant Obedience to be due. *What account can be given of this? Is it not true, literally true, that he doth not in express words, or indeed so much as by implication, mention a Liberty to resist our lawful Governors, when even such as the Emperors under whom he lived? And is it not as true, that he declares expressly that they are God's Ordinance, that there is no Power but of God, and that the Powers that be are ordained of God, and that he has woven this too closely into his Argument to be separated from it? S. Paul's avoiding the express, and even so much as oblique approbation of Resistance, is to me a Demonstration that his design at that time, as well as all others, was to put the utmost Bar against it. Had it been otherwise, who can think but that instead of saying as he doth, Let every soul be subject to the Higher Powers, for there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be, are ordained of God, he must necessarily have been led to say, Let every Soul be subject to those Powers only who govern as they ought; these you must obey, for their Care of the Publick Safety and Happiness; but if they deflect from this, they are no longer the Ordinance of God, but it is Honourable and Glorious to oppose them; nay under such Governors a Passive Non-resistance will appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary? But all who can think will I hope allow, that the Apostle knew best his own design, was the fittest Judge of what it became him to say, that what*

he hath said doth truly become him ; and that we ought to take his own express Words as the Rule for finding out his Design, or rather as the only undoubted indication of his Intent and Meaning. It is a vain attempt to say, he speaks only of good Rulers, when he speaks of Rulers in general, and positively teaches *there is no Power*, whether gentle or cruel, just or unjust, but from God, and *whosoever therefore resisteth the Power*, the Power indefinitely, *resisteth the Ordinance of God*, and *shall receive Damnation* for it ; it is a vain attempt, I say, to affirm that these Words relate to none but good Governors, when it is plain they speak of Governors without any restriction. Nor is it to be imagined, that any Reader of but tolerable Understanding, and who comes with an unbiassed Mind to the consideration of them, should ever put such a contrary interpretation upon them. Mr. H. indeed has shewn his Ingenuity in doing it : But whether he had not much better have left them to be understood in their own natural genuine Sense, than to have preached against his Text, and then undertaken an elaborate *Vindication* of what he thus preached, is worthy his serious and impartial Consideration. And he would do well deliberately, and as in the sight of God the Judge of all, both Men and Actions, to weigh with himself, how sad an Evidence this is, of (a) *a heady concern for an Hypothesis*, and *a cold regard for a matter of infinitely greater importance*. I am sure, Mr. H. in this is so far from following the Apostle, as he professes he ought to do, that it is a flat Contradiction to all he has said upon this subject ; as I hope I have sufficiently shewn in the former Treatise. Whither therefore I refer Mr. H. for the Satisfaction he demands ; and am pretty confident he may meet with it there, if it be not his own Fault. At present I shall beg leave to subjoin Mr. Calvin's Judgment in the Case ; professing, *That* (b) *whenever the Command of the Publick Society is committed*

C 4

ted

(a) *Exam. of the Patr. Scheme*, p. 90.

(b) *In homine deterrimo honoreq; omni indignissimo, pones quem modo sit publica potestas, præclaram illam & divinam*

ted to a bad Prince, though even the worst, and most unworthy of all Honour that can be, that illustrious and divine Power which God in his Word confers upon the Ministers of his Justice and Judgment, henceforward resides in him; and he is for this reason to have the same Reverence and Submission paid him by his Subjects, as to their common Obedience; that they would have paid to the best of Kings, if they had had him. And again, a little after, (a) If we are cruelly tortured by an outrageous Prince, or robbed and spoiled by one that is either covetous or luxurious, or are neglected through Sloath, or lastly if a wicked and sacrilegious Prince persecute us for our Religion; this should put us in mind of our Iniquities which have provoked God to chastise us with such Scourges, that so our Humility may restrain our Impatience. We should also bethink ourselves, that it is not our business to cure these Evils; and that all we have to do is to implore God's help; in whose Hand, the Hearts of Kings, and the State of their Kingdoms are. And not much different is that of his Friend Beza, who teaches (b) That the Apostle does not command to obey the Magistrate only when we cannot avoid it, as if it were lawful at another time to shake off his Yoke, but rather because it is most Just for us to be subject to God's Minister, and that this is no indifferent matter, but what we are obliged to in Conscience; and none can with a good Conscience resist him, to whom God has put him in subjection; and they that do it oppose not the Magistrate only, but God himself. And withal, That it is one thing not to obey a Prince commanding what is sinful, and forcibly to resist him is another: And though the one may and ought to be done, the other never must without a particular warrant from God for it; which Mr. H. does not pretend to be given to any of those whom he is so industriously preparing for Resistance upon the first occasion they shall apprehend themselves to meet with for it.

IX. That

nam potestatem residere, quam Dominus justitiæ ac judicii sui Ministris verbo suo detulit: proinde à subditis eadem in reverentiâ & dignatione habendum, quantum ad publicam obedientiam attinet, quâ optimum Regem, si daretur, habitori essent. *Calv. Instit. l. 4. c. 20. §. 25.*

(a) §. 29.

(b) In Rom. 13. 5.

IX. That Direction of *S. Paul to Titus*, That he put People in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates, *Mr. H.* takes no notice of; and therefore I shall not insist upon it here, save only so far as to desire the Reader to try, if with his utmost Skill any thing can be squeezed out of it, in favour of the Doctrine of Resistance.

X. That the Order given to *Timothy*, (a) For Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions and Giving of Thanks, to be made for Kings and all in Authority, should be brought against Resistance, to prove that it must in all cases be a Sin, (b) is what *Mr. H.* cannot assent to; and he thinks it without all Foundation. And for this Reason, Because we are required in unlimited Expressions to pray for our Enemies; and this does not imply that we are to pray in an unlimited manner for them; nor may we pray for our Governors Prosperity and Success, in what is Destructive of the Publick Good. All which, I must take the freedom to tell *Mr. H.* is quite besides the business. For if he had thought to look forward to the next Words, he would have found that our Prayers for Kings are not enjoined in unlimited Expressions, but here is a particular Direction in relation to them, that the scope of them be, That under them we may lead quiet and peaceable Lives, in all Godliness and Honesty. And I am very apt to think *Mr. H.* will not say, either that we are directed any where to pray in these terms with respect to our Enemies; or again, that these Prayers for our Governors and Resistance of them will well consist together, and a good Christian and loyal Subject may, at the same time, fairly and honestly do both.

XI. The Words of *S. Peter* come next to be considered, Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governors, as to those that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the Will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish Men, 1 *S. Pet.* 2. 12, 13, 14.
On

(a) 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2.

(b) *P.* 131.

On which the learned Archbishop Usher (a) recommends these following Observations. *First*, That this word *xr̃is* doth signify either a Creation, or a Creature ; by both which the holy Writers expreß the Work, not of any mortal Man, but of the Almighty and everliving God. *Secondly*, That this in Scripture is not restrained to the first Creation of all things only, but extended likewise to the Works of God's Providence, whether wrought by himself immediately, or by the intervention of other secondary Causes. *Thirdly*, That S. Peter by every human Creature intendeth to signify here, not Things but Persons ; as is manifest by the Division subjoined, Whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governors. *Fourthly*, That as Man, who by God's Ordinance was appointed to have Dominion over the other Creatures, hath by way of Excellency the name of *xr̃is*, or Creature, attributed unto him, as bearing therein a peculiar Stamp of the Image of his Creator ; so among Men themselves, such as by God's appointment are advanced to the Dignity of bearing rule over others, by like proportion may in a more especial manner, have the word Creature appropriated unto them, as carrying a deeper impression of this Image, and likewise of their Creator, by that Power it hath pleased him to grant to them, even over those to whom over the other Works of his Hands he hath given Dominion. And again, *Fifthly*, That such a Creature may very properly, for distinction sake, obtain the name of *ἀνδρωπῶν xr̃is*, as God's especial Creature among and over Men. For as (b) every Priest taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins ; so every civil Magistrate also taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to Men, (c) That they may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and Honesty. From which Premises this great Primate concludes the full meaning of the Apostle Peter in this place should be, Submit your selves to every Creature, or to every Man, who is a Creature constituted by God, among and over Men ; for the Lord's sake, whose Creature he is in

(a) Power of the Prince, Part. I. Sect. VI, VII, VIII, IX, X.

(b) Heb. 5. 1.

(c) 1 Tim. 2. 2.

in that place of Authority. And our Church mentioning these Words of the Apostle in one of her Homilies, declares them to be (a) *so plain of themselves* as to need no Explication.

Yet this is not enough to satisfy Mr. *H.* for be they as plain as may be, he can find out a different Interpretation here, as well as he could for *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. He knows how to find a Knot in a Bulrush, as readily as any Man. And accordingly he observes these following Particulars.

1. The Apostle *commands Submission to Human Authority, in general Terms, without defining the Measures of it.* Which I do not deny. But then I must desire Mr. *H.* to remember, that it is *Submission* that is commanded, and it will be hard for him to find a licence to *Resist* in a command to *Submit*, how general soever the Terms of it be. And whereas he adds, that *these Expressions were designed to recommend Active, as well as Passive Obedience, and that some cases must be excepted in relation to That,* the Reader must needs be sensible, that that Objection has been so oft repeated, and has received so full an Answer, that it would be but lost labour to say any thing of it here.

2. He *presses Submission, says Mr. H. to Governors sent by the King, as his Viceroy, into particular Countries;* and from hence he concludes, that they being sent for the *Punishment of Evil-doers, and for the Praise of them that do Well,* no Submission therefore is due to them any longer, than they faithfully answer this End of their Office. Which Argument labours under these several Defects. *First,* He supposes it lawful to Resist such *Viceroy,* as do not rightly discharge their Duty in the Places they are sent to, not considering that Resisting them is Resisting the King, or Emperor, by whom they are sent. And it is not reasonable that he should be Resisted for their Faults, which he has no way designed, or been privy to. It may happen that an upright and just Emperor may be mistaken in the Persons he trusts with

(a) *Third part of the Serm. of Obedience, p. 70.*

with his Power: And Mr. *H.* has not yet said that a good Governor is to be resisted, purely for being unhappily imposed upon, by the fair Pretences of such as had been too cunning for him. *Secondly*, He here according to custom, resolves all the Authority of these *Viceroy's*, into the Peace and Happiness of those over whom they are set, and so makes them Resistible whenever they act contrary to this. Which having largely shewn to be his grand fundamental Mistake, I need say no more of it here. *Thirdly*, He takes no notice that the Apostle requires Submission *for the Lord's sake*; which is a different Reason for it from that of *Publick Good*, and makes all Resistance highly criminal.

3. He urges farther, that *S. Peter* requires this Submission in order to the putting a stop to a Scandal raised upon Christians, as if they had pretended an Exemption from such an Obedience, and were Enemies to so useful an Office as that of *Magistrates*. But sure this is no Proof that they ought not to be obedient, as was before required, but that they should the rather be so. This is a farther Argument for Submission to Governors, that they ought to pay it out of regard to their most holy Religion, and as they tendred the Honour and Reputation of That. But what Mr. *H.* can infer from hence, in behalf of that Resistance which the Apostle dissuades from, by inviting to *submit*, not only for the Lord's sake, but also for the Credit of Religion, is past my understanding to conceive.

4. *S. Peter*, says Mr. *H.* argues the Christians into Submission from the Usefulness of *Magistrates* to Human Society. And be it so; let this be one of the Arguments he uses to this purpose; it is notorious he uses two others to the same purpose, that this Submission is to be paid *for the Lord's sake*, who enjoins and expects it from us; and for our Religion sake, which would be highly disparaged by the Undutifulness and Disloyalty of its Professors. And now suppose the first of these Reasons for Submission cease, there is no Pretence for imagining, the other two must both cease with it; and yet till they do cease, there can be no Liberty of Resistance.

XII. The Apostle exhorts *Servants* (a) to be subject to their Masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward; and gives this Reason of his Exhortation, For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience towards God endure grief, suffering wrongfully; and Mr H. is highly offended (b) That some Writers should pretend to draw an Argument from hence for Absolute Passive-obedience in Subjects. S. Peter, says he, advises Slaves, who were in a state of perfect Captivity, to bear with the evil Treatment their Masters might sometimes bestow upon them; putting them in mind that the great Glory of Patience is to bear Injuries, and unjust Usage, without reviling or revenge. But Subjects, generally speaking, are not in a state of Captivity, and therefore it is absurd to suppose he would lay down the same Precepts for both. This is easily said, but Mr. H. should have proved this Absurdity, and not expected Persons to depend upon his bare Word for it. Here, says (c) Grotius, are two things to be noted: First, That what is spoken of being subject even to hard Masters, is to be no less understood in relation to Kings, inasmuch as what follows as the Superstructure upon this Foundation, respects the Duty of Subjects, as well as that of Servants: And Secondly, That such Subjection is required of us, as implies a patient suffering of Injuries; as has used to be said of Parents, (d) *Ama parentem, si quis est; si non, feras*: Love a kind and good Father; and bear with him that is otherwise. To the same purpose also S. Augustin, (e) having spoken of the Duty of Servants even to bad Masters, adds what I have said of Masters and Servants, is to be understood of Kings and all the Higher Powers. And certainly there is no Incongruity in giving the same Precept to Two that owe the same Duty, though it be upon very different accounts. A Son and his Father's Servant are both obliged to the same Duty, of Obedience to the same Person, but in different respects, yet sure Mr. H. will

(a) V. 18, 19.

(b) P. 128.

(c) De jur. B. & P. l. 1. c. 4. n. 4. §. 6.

(d) Terent. Hecyr.

(e) In Psal. 124,

will not say, it is an Absurdity to invite them both to the performance of this one Duty, to which they are thus differently obliged. A hired Servant is not a Slave, and yet so long as both are obliged to Fidelity and Submission to their Master, there is no Absurdity in requiring them to behave themselves accordingly; and even in the Apostle's Words, *not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward*. A Layman is not a Clergyman, and yet there is no Absurdity in requiring them both to Pray to and Worship God. And so in multitudes of other cases. And there is not the least Pretence for any more Absurdity in relation to Subjects and Slaves; nor any Reason why this Precept of the Apostle may not suit the one, as well as the other. Especially if we attend to the following Words; *For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure Grief, suffering wrongfully*. For I am very sure there is nothing in this Argument that is peculiar to Slaves, and does not equally concern all that are unjustly used by their Superiours, in whatsoever station.

But he argues farther; *S. Peter is not content to preach Submission to these Slaves in general Terms, but puts the case of ill natured, and hard, and unreasonable Masters, from whence one would be apt to argue, that if he had intended the same in the case of Tyrannical Princes, he would as plainly have said so, as he doth in the case of Masters*. And hath he not done it very clearly, in forbidding to Resist such Princes as *Claudius* and *Nero*, and such Governors as they should send to rule the Provinces under their Dominion? Under which of these Emperors this Epistle was written (a) is not yet determined, (b) though most incline to think it was under the former. But which soever of them then reigned, how could the Apostle more plainly declare the Necessity, of submitting to the worst of Princes, than by requiring it to such an

(a) See Dr. Whitby's Preface to this Epistle.

(b) Dr. Hammond Annotat. D. Cavei Hist. Liter. p. 5. A Lapide in 1 Ep. S. Pet. Proëm. Du Pin Nov. Biblioth. To. I. Dissert. Prelim. p. 68. & Dissert. Prelim. sur la Bible. l. 2. c. 10. p. 62.

an one? And that Mr. *H.* cannot see, what is so evident to every one that does not wilfully shut his Eyes, I can resolve into nothing but a *heady concern for an Hypothesis*, that will not suffer him to look before him. If the Apostle had only forbidden Slaves to resist such a Master as *Vedius Pollio*, (*a*) who inhumanly ordered one of his Servants to be thrown into the Pond to feed his Fishes, only for breaking of a Glass, would not this have been accounted a sufficient Admonition not to resist any the most imperious and merciless Master? And it is to all Intents and Purposes as reasonable to conclude, that a Prohibition of Subjects resisting a *Claudius* or a *Nero*, should be understood to prohibit the resisting any the worst of Princes. And it is but vain therefore for Mr. *H.* to fancy *S. Peter* has not condemned the Resistance of bad Governors, since it is plain he requires to be subject to every supreme Ruler; and this too in the time of such a Prince as one of these forementioned, hereby shewing that the Submission he requires is due to those that notoriously *deflect from their Duty*, and act much against the End of their Institution.

And yet farther, had *S. Peter* not so plainly required to be subject to wicked and destructive Princes, might not one argue against Mr. *H.* that the Apostle might not name tyrannical Princes, because he might reckon this following Instruction to Servants, to serve in like manner as a warning to Subjects not to rise against their Princes, who have a Power paramount to that of Masters, and over the Masters themselves no less than the meanest of their Servants, or because the Duty of Subjects had been so often inculcated in other parts of Scripture, or for some other less obvious Reason? Whatsoever was the the cause of this Omission, if it were one, I cannot conceive Mr. *H.* will lay so great Stress upon it, as to think it a sufficient ground to venture his eternal Salvation upon, since nothing can be concluded from it, and especially in opposition to many other Texts of Scripture, requiring Submission to, and forbidding

(*a*) Senec. de Ira, l. 3. c. 40.

ding all Resistance of the *Higher Powers*, and more particularly to the Words of this Apostle himself, enjoining in general Terms, *To submit to every humane Ordinance, or Creature, for the Lord's sake, and for our Religion's sake.*

Once more Mr. *H.* takes it for an Evidence, that the Apostle *S. Peter's* Injunction does not require a Submission in all cases, because delivered only in general Terms, and he does not particularize *froward* and tyrannical Princes, to be submitted to, as in the case of Masters: But I think I have already shewn that he has plainly enough declared this Submission due to bad Princes, such as he lived and wrote under. And yet suppose he had not, I would desire Mr. *H.* to put the case in a parallel Instance, and see then what appearance it will have, and what his own determination would be concerning it. Suppose a Highwayman should plead for himself that he did not delight in Robbery, but condemned it, (as Mr. *H.* says *he does Resistance*) and only used it in great Streights, and when he must be utterly undone without it. He wants Money, and knows not how to live, but by taking this course to relieve his Necessities. And yet in all his greatest Streights he takes great care, to rob none but who are rich, and can easily spare so much as his occasions call for. So that whatsoever they may think of it, he is sure no real Hurt is done them. Possibly he has only eased them of what they would have spent in Riot and Excess, Lewdness and Debauchery, to the ruin of their immortal Souls, or in unjust and needless Lawsuits, not only to their own, but to their Neighbour's Damage and Vexation. And upon these considerations, he did nothing but what was *honourable and glorious* in seizing it, and putting it to a better use than they would have done. And what fault can there be in this? If he got it by Stealth and Robbery, so long as he could not have it otherwise, and he took care never to wrong the Poor of any thing how small soever, who will blame him for it? He has read the Scriptures daily, and searched them carefully from the beginning to the end, and has well and seriously weighed

weighed the Eighth Commandment, and other Texts against Stealing, and he cannot discover his Practice to be any where condemned by them. They are all *in general Terms*, and he can no where find the case put of a poor Man's robbing the Rich. Robbery is indeed forbidden at large; but no prohibition appears as to this particular case. So that he has good reason to believe, he is yet safe as to the other World, if he can but escape as well in this. Especially considering how urgent his own, and his Family's Necessities are, and how unnatural a Parent and Husband he must be, if he do not take this course to provide for them. Nor is it to be supposed the Scripture should have so little regard for the Welfare of Mankind, incomparably the greater part of whom are but in a low and mean condition, and exposed to such frequent Streights and Difficulties, as not to allow them to consult their own Preservation, though at the cost of such as have not the like occasion for what is thus taken from them. And as for any other sort of Robbery he is no way concerned about it, nor can any one pretend he is. This is a Plea exactly parallel to Mr. H's. And yet as it would not save the Neck of him that robs only with this *Prudence* and *Caution*, if once convict of having done it; so I dare be bold to say, if Mr. H. himself were his Casuist, he would not undertake to assure him, that it will stand him in any stead at the last Day, when he shall come to appear before our Lord's Tribunal. Let him then compare this way of arguing with his own; and give any tolerable Reason, why his should be thought to be of force, whilst this is of none.

Mr. H. adds, *What is here said concerning Slaves, cannot be proved to hold good in respect to hired Servants.* Whereto I answer, That it is very easily proved, οἰκέται, the Word here used by the Apostle, being of a larger Extent than Mr. H. supposes. So (a) *Snidas* teaches, and (b) *Hesychius*,

D

sychius,

(a) 'Οἰκέται ἢ μόνον δεσπόποντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἰκέται ἢ δούλοι.

(b) 'Οἰκέται εἰ κατὰ οἶκον πάντες.

ychius, and (a) *Julius Pollux*, and (b) *H. Stevens*, and (c) *Phavorinus* and (d) other Lexicographers, and Glossarists. And accordingly in the New Testament, *δουτῶν οἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ*, *Acts* 10. 7. is rendered *two of his household Servants*, not only in our Version, but in that (e) of the vulgar Latine, and the (f) Translation from the Arabick, and to the same sense (g) in that from the Ethiopick. In short, I take this Word to be always understood to import not Slaves only, but the rest of the Family, and consequently all the hired Servants that are among them. Nor can it be said, those to whom this Epistle was written had no such: For it is directed (h) to the dispersed, (i) that is to the scattered *Jews*, that were in *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia*, (the (k) lesser *Asia*, or rather one particular part of it) and *Bithynia*. And that the *Jews* had of old hired Servants, is proved from divers (l) places in the Old Testament, where they are expressly mentioned, and distinguished from those who were *bought with Money*, and so were their proper Goods. And the difference between the Duty of hired Servants and Slaves in this point, I take

to

(a) *Οἰκέτης*, domesticus, *οἰκέτις*, domestica. *l.* 3. *segm.* 74.

(b) *Οἰκέτης*, domesticus, ex *Aristoph.* *Nub.* οἱ δὲ οἰκέται ἐγγυεῖν, omnes domestici, tota familia.

(c) *Οἰκέται*, οἱ γὰρ τὸ οἶκον πάντες.

(d) Who render *οἰκέτης*, by Domesticus, as well as Servus.

(e) Duobus famulis suis. (f) Duobus è famulis suis.

(g) Duobus militibus ex hominibus domus ejus.

(h) ch. 1. 1.

(i) *Judæis* scilicet, nam illis præcipuè destinatus erat *Petrus*. *Grot.* in loc. *Ναποοῦς*, sic vocantur, loci omnes in quibus *Israelitæ* extra patriam vivebant, quocunq; tempore, quacunq; occasione, &c. *ibid.* To the *Jews* that have received the Faith, and are dispersed and sojourn in *Pontus*, &c. *Dr. Hammond* on the words. It was written to the *Jews*, dispersed through *Pontus*, *Galatia*, &c. *Dr. Whitby*.

(k) *Ionîæ*, in quâ *Ephesus*. In quâ regione plurimi *Judæi*. *Josephus* XII. 3. XIV. 17. in *Dolabellæ* edicto, & XVI. 3. ubi in *Ionîæ* urbibus ingentem ait fuisse *Judæorum* multitudinem. *Grot.* in loc.

(l) *Exod.* 12. 45. *Levit.* 25. 6, 39, 40, 53. *Deut.* 24. 14.

to be no more than that they might have such legal Remedies, against their merciless and tyrannical Masters, as the others had not, and were to serve only according to their Covenant; and when the time covenanted for should be expired, they were at liberty to depart, which the other were never to do, unless manumitted by them. But whilst they continued Servants, they were both of them to be faithful, and submissive to their Masters, though froward and very uneasy to them. Most certainly neither of them, how hardly soever used, might upon any Pretence turn their Masters out of Doors, and seize upon their Inheritance; as Mr. *H.* would have it done to wicked and tyrannical Princes.

But Mr. *H.* (*a*) denies Subjects ordinarily speaking to be Slaves; and thence concludes them not obliged to that patient Submission, and Non-resistance, which is required of Slaves. In answer whereto I shall not stand to convince him, how arbitrary and despotical several Kings have been, and some in the World yet are, and what great Slaves their Subjects are to them by their Constitution; but rather shall desire him to consider that a sovereign Prince, where not so absolute, is yet more eminently *the Minister of God*, than any Master whatsoever; and so acting by a more sacred Authority, has a Right to a compleater Subjection of those over whom he is set, than any Master can pretend to. He might also farther remember, the Obligations Subjects are under, upon account of the Oaths taken by them to their Sovereign. Which I hope he will not deny, to lay a far more powerful Tye upon them, to perform the Allegiance so promised and engaged for, than any that does, or can lie upon Slaves from the Right their Masters have over them. Nor can a Subject who has abjured all Resistance, be more at liberty to make use of it, upon whatever Provocation, than the merest Slave that ever was. According to Mr. *H.*'s own Casuistry, (*b*) *It is indeed praise-worthy in a private Person to suffer patiently, and contentedly, when such suffering*
D 2 cannot

(*a*) P. 129.

(*b*) P. 130.

cannot possibly, or honourably, be avoided ; as it certainly cannot when attended with the breach of our sworn as well as natural Allegiance. And I presume he will not deny Perjury and Rebellion to be at least as criminal in greater and more publick Persons, as in any the meanest and most obscure Subject.

I own, if we take Mr. *H*'s word for it, *the only Debate that can concern a Christian upon S. Peter's reasoning, will be this, Whether of the two is more glorious and praise-worthy, to labour and suffer in maintaining the Cause of a Nation's Rights and Liberties, or in such a submission as betrays them for ever, into the Hands of Violence and Ambition.* But then I must beg Mr. *H*'s pardon, if I take leave to affirm on the contrary, that this is not a true state of the Question ; and that if we attend to S. Peter himself, we shall quickly see that upon his Reasoning, *the only Debate that can concern a Christian will be, Whether of the two is more glorious and praise-worthy, to suffer quietly and patiently under evil Governors, for the Lord's sake, and that after this manner, by well doing we may put to silence the Ignorance of foolish men, or for the prevention of any temporal Evils, that might befall either ourselves or others, to shew ourselves disobedient to Authority in contradiction to the Apostle's express Injunction to be Subject and not Resist.* And this is a Case requires no depth of thought, nor any time for consideration, nor indeed any thing else but a little Honesty, and a small acquaintance with the nature of our most Holy Religion to determine it.

Thus I have shewn how positive the holy Scripture is, against all Resistance of the supreme Authority, in whomsoever it resides, or how grossly soever abused to God's dishonour, and the Subjects peril and detriment. I have also considered the opposite Doctrine of Mr. *H*. and how far all he has said is from invalidating the Directions given in Scripture, for Patience and Submission under the worst of Governors. And now upon a brief comparison, I leave it to the Reader seriously, and as he will answer it at the last Day, to determine whether of these Guides he will adhere to, the holy Scripture, or

or Mr. H's. *Measures of Submission*, it being as impossible to follow both, as it is to *serve God and Mammon*. The Scripture teaches to *fear God and the King*, to own his Authority as from above, to be *subject to Principalities and Powers*, to *submit to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake* and for *silencing the Ignorance of foolish Men*, to *pray for Kings and all in Authority*, and not to *revile or curse them*, though ever so privately; to *honour and obey them*, and not to *take up the Sword against them*, or *resist them upon pain of Damnation*. Mr. H. teaches that it is *Honourable and Glorious to Resist a bad Governor*, from whom the People at any time apprehend themselves in danger of being, or perhaps already feel themselves, very ill used, or even though he only *deflect from the Will of God*, and do not continually attend upon the promotion of the Publick Welfare and Happiness. This he may call *following S. Paul* and the rest of the sacred Writers; but the best of it is, every one is not bound to believe or follow him, when he says so. For after all his expounding, and wrestling, and misinterpreting, it is still undeniable that *Cursing of Kings is not Praying for them*, *Opposing them is not Honouring them*, *Taking Arms against them is not Submitting to them*, *Resistance is not Obedience*.

C H A P. II.

Whether Mr. H's. Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians?

HAVING thus far shewn the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and how full they are against all Resistance of Authority, I propounded next to enquire, into the Sentiments of the Primitive Christians in this respect. Not as if what is taught in Scripture were not of it self sufficiently obligatory, to all that profess themselves our Lord's Disciples, and hope to be

saved by him ; but because these were the best Expofitors of the meaning of thofe facred Writings, as who might well be fupposed to underftand, what was delivered by our bleffed Saviour and his Apoftles, if any whofoever ever did. They were likewise of fuch unspotted Integrity, and fo fincere and upright in all their Proceedings, that we may fafely reft affured they would ftrictly adhere to, what they apprehended to be the Will and true Intent of our bleffed Lord. And hence it follows on the contrary, that to introduce a Doctrine contrary to theirs, and a Practice no way fuiting with what was obfervable in them, muft be to attempt the Subverfion of our moft Holy Religion, fo far as this Variation extends. And whether this be not the Cafe of Mr. H. in relation to our prefent Debate, I come now to confider.

Mr. H. I confeß difcards them as no proper Judges in the Cafe, but for no other reason fave only because they are not of his fide. He fees they are undeniably againft him, and therefore thinks it neceffary to be againft them. But this all muft allow to be no commendation of his System, but a great difparagement to it, and an invincible Argument againft it. Never was our moft Holy Religion fo exactly defcribed in the Lives of its Profefors, as in theirs who lived in the firft Ages of it, and a great part of whom died Martyrs for it. Thefe fhewed forth the lively Senfe they had of our Redeemer's infinite Love to Mankind, and of the Redemption he had wrought out for them, and the Hope he had fet before them, and the Precepts he had given them in charge ; and thought they could never do or fuffer too much for Him, who had humbled himfelf in fo ftupendous a manner for them, to refcue them out of the Jaws of everlafting Destruction, and procure them a Title to a heavenly Inheritance. They looked upon themfelves as Strangers and Sojourners upon Earth, and whole great Bußneß it was to make fure of a better Eftate, againft they fhould be taken hence. And accordingly their Minds were fixed upon the *things above* ; and their conftant Study was to be conformed to their

Bleßed

Blessed Lord's Example, and to fulfil all his Commands to the best of their power. And well knowing Obedience to those in Authority, to be one necessary Branch of their Religion, they were far more solicitous to acquit themselves aright in this respect, than to secure a temporal state of Peace and Prosperity in this World. They were of a submissive, passive Temper, little concerned for the Body, or the things of it, but very desirous to be eternally saved, whatsoever might become of them in the mean time. They thought it far better, both safer for themselves, and more for God's Glory, and the Honour and Advancement of their Religion, to lay down their Lives for it, than either live, or dye Rebels against their lawful, though otherwise unjust, tyrannical, and persecuting Emperors; and so have left us an Example highly deserving our most serious Imitation. As I shall endeavour to prove, by answering these four following Enquiries.

I. What was the Doctrine of these ancient and most exemplary Christians, concerning Obedience to Governors.

II. What their Practice was in this respect.

III. What Obligation we are under to the imitation of them.

IV. What Mr. *H.* has offered to the contrary, and to how little purpose. The consideration of which Particulars will be a powerful Argument for convincing the serious and impartial Reader, how ill the Doctrine of Resistance becomes a Preacher of the Gospel, and how cautious all Christians ought to be, and how averse to giving ear to it. To these therefore I now apply myself in the four following Sections.

S E C T. I.

What the Doctrine of the Primitive Christians was as to the Duty of Obedience to Governors.

A Very little Enquiry will suffice to inform us beyond all doubt, that these truly pious and exemplary

Professors of our Religion were clearly against all Resistance of Authority, in whomsoever it resided, or how ill soever managed or abused. They never called to Arm upon any the greatest Provocation, though none ever met with more than they did, none having been worse used by their enraged Princes than they were, nor any in the World having ever deserved it less. The Cruelties, Tortures, Deaths they conflicted with from time to time, were enough to put them beyond all patience, had it not been for the wonderful influence their Religion had upon their Souls, and the powerful supernatural Assistance that was administered them from on high. No Barbarities were thought too hard to be executed upon these holy, inoffensive Followers of our Lord, nor any the slightest Pretence too little to give occasion for them. And yet it is easy to observe, how all the while they breathed forth nothing but Patience and Submission, and a ready compliance with whatsoever God in his good Providence should see fit to lay upon them. They taught Obedience, an active Obedience, to their Sovereigns in all things lawful, and a passive Subjection and Suffering in other cases, and never to Rebel, or list themselves in their own Defence against Authority, how inhumanly soever abused to their Destruction, nor even to break forth into any irreverent and indecent Expressions, against their tyrannical Superiours.

The Constitutions called *Apostolical* direct, (a) *To fear the King, as God's Institution and Ordinance.* And the Canons so called enjoin, (b) *Not to revile the King or Ruler, as being against all Law and Justice; and order that such of the Clergy as should presume to do it should be deposed; and a Layman to be excommunicated.* Which Canon the Commentators upon it declare, to have forbidden all Reviling and undutiful Reproaching the sovereign Prince, though not all Reprehension of him for

(a) Τὸν Βασιλέα φοβηθήσῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι τῷ κυεῖν ἐστὶν ἡ χεῖρ-
τονία. 1. 7. c. 17.

(b) Ὅστις ὑβρίσῃ βασιλέα ἢ ἄρχοντα παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον, πτωχὴν
πνύτω· καὶ εἰ μὴ κληρικὸς, χαιδεύειτο, εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφορίζεται.
Can. 84.

for his Faults. The like Judgment concerning it, the learned Bishop *Beveridge* also notes to have been given by *Harmenopulus*, and that *S. Ambrose* and *S. Chrysostom* practised accordingly. And if the Compilers of these Canons would not admit of an indecent Treatment of their Governors in Words, it is a natural inference, that they would much less have allowed to take up Arms against them. And that this was the Opinion and Doctrine of those purer Times is too plain for any one to question it, who has but in any tolerable degree been conversant in their Writings, and has read them with any sort of attention and impartiality.

We have little left of the Writings of the first Century, and the Christian Church being then in its infancy, and its Members few comparatively to what were afterwards, it is no wonder if we meet with no Instances of any that were then in circumstances to have resisted, if they would; though withal, from what they had been so lately taught, it is easy to believe, they would by no means have done it, if they could. It is evident as to *S. Ignatius*, a Disciple of the Apostles, and (a) who had familiarly conversed with them, who lived in this Century, and suffered Martyrdom in the beginning of the next, that he bare all the ill Usage that befel him, with an undaunted Courage and Resignation to the Divine Will, and without endeavouring to incense any against those who were the Authors or Promoters of his Death.

And which is more full to the purpose we are upon, in this second Century *Justin Martyr*, in his Apology to *Antoninus Pius* and his Sons, testifies of the Christians, that they were the best of all their Subjects; in that (b) they were the forwardest of all to pay their Tributes and Customs, and though they worshiped God only, they were obedient to them in all things else, Praying for them, that together with their Royal Power, they might enjoy a sound Mind;

(a) Συναίχθητο τοῖς ἀποστόλοις γνησίως. B. Chrysost. εἰς τὸ ἄχην ἱερομαρτυρεῖ Ἰγνάτιον.

(b) Apol. 2. p. 64.

Alind; admonishing them withal of the ill consequence of neglecting their Christian Subjects, and taking no care of them whilst they thus prayed for them, and dealt so openly and plainly with them; not threatening them with any Opposition or Resistance upon the account of their ill Government, as Mr. H. would have done, but only putting them in mind of the Account of their Power, that must be given to Almighty God at the last Day, and the eternal Fire wherein they must expect to be punished for their Abuse of it. So his Contemporary Athenagoras tells Antoninus and his Son Commodus, That the Christians (a) prayed for the Empire, that the Son might succeed to his Father's Throne, as was most just, and that their Dominion might be extended far and near, that under these Governors themselves might live quietly and peaceably, and as became dutiful and obedient Subjects. In like manner Theophilus of Antioch profess'd, (b) He would not worship the Emperor any more than the Heathen Gods, but yet he would be sure to pray for him, as knowing him to be constituted by God, not to have religious Worship, but to have all lawful Honour paid him. And a little after (c) says he, Honour the King, honour him, and shew thyself well affected towards him, being subject to him and praying for him, for so doing thou performest the Will of God, whose Law commands to honour God and the King, and disobey neither of them. Where it is observable he has no more reservation for Resisting the King, than for Resisting God himself. For he requires, according to the Translation of the Seventy, (d) to be disobedient to neither of them. About the same time with him lived Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna, a Disciple of S. John. And he, when the Proconsul would have persuaded him to renounce Christ, and swear by Cesar's Fortune or Genius, threatening him with the Beasts and the Fire upon his non-compliance, resolutely answered, (e) He was a Christian, and was ready to justify such his Profession, if he might but be allowed a day for it; adding however, to shew the

(a) Legat. pro Christianis. p. 39, 40. (p. 165. Edit. Ox. 1682.)

(b) Ad Autol. l. 1. p. 76. (p. 30. Ed. Ox.) (c) P. 77. (p. 33. Ed. Ox. 1684.)

(d) Μὴ δ' ἐρέω ὑμῶν ἀπειθήσεις. Prov. 24. 21.

(e) Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. de S. Polycarpi Martyrio, Sect. X.

the deference both himself and his Fellow-christians bare to Authority, that (a) *they had learned to pay, as was most proper, all the Honour to Powers and Rulers, that they could with safety to themselves, that is to say, (b) without endangering the loss of their Souls, for here is no mention at all of any regard had to their temporal Welfare, as I shall observe more particularly in its proper place; giving moreover this Caution to the Proconsul, (c) πῦρ ἀμικρὸν, &c. Thou threatenest me with Fire that will burn but for a short time, before it be extinguished, but art not aware of that Fire whereto the wicked shall be condemned at the last Judgment, and which is reserved for their eternal Punishment.* Thus he puts the Proconsul in mind of the dreadful Vengeance, whereto he was like to expose himself from Almighty God in the other World; but gives not the least hint of any Correction or Opposition he was to expect from his Subjects here in this.

In the latter part of this Age *Irenæus* was Bishop of Lyons, and he taught that (d) *the Word saith by Solomon, By me Kings reign, and the powerful hold, or decree Justice; by me Princes are exalted, and by me Tyrants govern the Earth; and the Apostle Paul says this, Be subject to all the higher Powers, (without exception of the bad, and for this reason, which extends equally to all,) for there is no Power but of God, and those that be, are ordained of God. And forasmuch as he speaks not of the Angelical Powers, or of invisible Princes, but of human Powers; he says, for this reason ye pay Tribute, for they are the Ministers of God, attending on this very thing, which the Lord also himself confirmed, by commanding to pay the Collectors of Tribute, both for himself and for Peter; because, as was said, they are the Ministers of God serving to this very purpose. For seeing Man, upon his departure from God, became so brutish, as to take even his nearest Kindred for Enemies,*
and

(a) Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. de S. Polycarpi Martyrio. Sect. X.

(b) Magistratibus enim & Potestatibus à Deo constitutis eum honorem, qui nostrorum animorum salutis nostræque religioni nihil afferat detrimenti, pro dignitate tribuere docemur. As Christopherson renders the Words in Eusebius Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 15.

(c) Sect. XI.

(d) L. 5. c. 24.

and to live under no Obedience, in all Disorder, and Murder, and Covetousness; God has imposed upon him the fear of a Man, that being subject to the Power of Men, and being bound by their Law, they may have some Justice done them, and may be governed one by another, fearing the Sword they see is held over them, as the Apostle saith, For he beareth not the Sword in vain, for he is the Minister of God, an Avenger for Wrath to him that doth Evil. And for this reason, the Magistrates having the Laws for their Direction, shall never be accountable or suffer for what they do justly. But when they act wickedly, contrary both to Law and Justice, and like Tyrants, not Kings, they shall perish by the just Judgment of God, which reaches equally to all, and spares none. And a little after, By whose Command Men are born, by his Command also are Kings ordained, as suits the Circumstances of those over whom they are set; some for the Amendment and Benefit of their Subjects, and the Preservation of Justice; and some for Fear, and Punishment, and Reproof, and some again for Contempt, and Reproach, and Pride, as the People shall have deserved; the just Judgment of God reaching, as we have already said, equally to all. Thus this famous Bishop and Martyr presses Obedience to Princes, from the same Considerations with the Apostle, requiring to be subject to them as God's Ordinance, and not to rise up against them for their own defence, but to leave it to God to punish them when they deflect from their Duty, and impiously and unrighteously seek the Ruin, rather than the Welfare and Happiness of the Society.

In the latter part of the second Century, and beginning of the third, lived *Tertullian*; who in his noble Apology for the Christians, and his Address to *Scapula* the Proconsul of *Africk*, presses the Duty of Obedience, when at the same time he declares they could easily have taken a different course with their persecuting Princes, if their Religion had not tied up their hands; as I shall have occasion to shew in the next Section. At present I observe from him, that (b) the Emperors received

(b) *Apol. c. 30.*

ved their Authority from God, and had no Power above them but his; that they were Seconds to him, and the First that were after him; were above all Men living, and therefore great because only less than Heaven, being made Emperors by him, who made them Men before they were Emperors. A plain acknowledgment that they received their Commission from God, and being subject to him only, must therefore be accountable to none of their Subjects, but to him alone. Again says he, (c) *We reverence the Ordinance of God in the Emperors, their Authority being committed to them by him.* And again, (d) *We cannot but reverence the Emperor, as one whom our God has made choice of; and I may justly say, Cæsar is ours rather than yours, being set in that Station by our God.* And not long after, complaining of the disaffection and undutifulness of other Subjects to the Emperor, in wishing secretly for fresh Cæsars one after another, for their own private Advantage, and this even when they made open profession of praying for just the contrary; (e) *A Christian,* says he, *can no more say as those do, than he can wish for a new Cæsar, namely, in order to the partaking of the largesses that were given upon such Occasions.* He also invites his fellow-Christians to bear patiently all the Trials and difficulties it should seem good to God to bring them into. (f) *Absit ab hac sectâ, &c.* says he, *Far be it from the Professors of our most holy Religion, to revenge themselves by Fire, (and the case is the same as to Arms) or to be disturbed at the Suffering of whatever God has order'd for the proof of their Fidelity;* after this manner referring them to God, the Author of all they endured, and not to the Instrument employed under him, putting them in mind with what Calmness and Serenity, what Contentment and Submission they ought to bear it, and that they were not to endeavour to shake off their Yoke, till he should be graciously pleased to ease them of it. And in the same Apology, speaking of Hippis, who was slain whilst actually engaged in a design upon his City, he subjoins, (g) *It was such a Design as no Christian ever was*
con-

concerned in for the Deliverance of his Brethren, though when under the Pressure of the utmost Inhumanity. From which memorable Words, the learned Mr. Reeves has made this just Observation, and highly pertinent and useful to my present purpose. (b) That which I think most remarkable in this Comparison between a Philosopher and a Christian, is, that he concludes the whole with the Instance of Rebellion in Hippias, a thing, says he, which no Christian was ever heard to have attempted for the Rescue of his Brethren, tho' under the most provoking and barbarous Usage. This upon all occasions he shews to be the distinguishing Character of Christians; this he triumphs upon, and therefore concludes the period with Non-resistance, like an Orator who gradually rises higher and higher, and clinches all with that he thinks most likely to leave the deepest Impression. But I return to Tertullian himself, who makes this Profession in behalf of the Christian Subjects of the Empire, (a) We sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor, but to our God and his, and as we are commanded, with unfeigned Prayer. He had likewise said just before, A Christian is no man's Enemy, not only not the Emperor's, whom knowing to be of God's appointment, he must needs love him, and reverence and honour him, and desire his Safety, and that of his Empire, that it may continue, as it will, to the end of the World. Wherefore we worship the Emperor, as far as is permitted us, or is Expedient for him, as a Man who is next under God, and has received all his Power from God, and is less than God only, and thus is above all others, and inferior to none but the True God. And now will Mr. H. say all this is spoken, like one that wanted to get rid of his Sovereign, and was persuaded he ought to be laid aside, whensoever he should neglect his Duty, or at least when he should presume to act contrary to the End of his Institution? But I proceed.

Not long after, in the third Century, Origen speaks likewise to the same purpose. For Celsus having objected to the Christians, that their Religion had its first rise from a seditious Opposition to the Jews, whom they had

(b) In loc.

(a) Ad Scapul. c. 2.

had hereupon taken occasion to desert, and to set themselves against them; he replies, That (a) it was impossible to tell of any seditious Insurrection the Christians had ever been guilty of; and that had they ever risen, as is here pretended, against the Jews, their Lawgiver would never have forbidden all Murder, nor would his Disciples, had they had their first beginning from a Rebellion, have admitted of such gentler Laws, as should expose them to be led like Sheep to the slaughter, without ever daring to revenge themselves upon their Persecutors. Than which, what could be more directly opposite to Mr. H's. Doctrine of Resistance? And at another time he gives this Character of them, (b) That they refused not to dye for their Integrity. And that (c) they knew no way of departing out of this Life more worthily, than by laying it down for the sake of Virtue and Religion, whensoever this condition was imposed by those Magistrates, or Judges, who reckon'd themselves to have the Power over their Lives, that either they must dye for their Obedience to their Lord's Commands, or save their Lives by acting contrary to his Laws. Whereby it appears the Christians were then of such an humble Passive Temper, that they might with as much shew of reason be charged with Robbery, or Perjury, or Idolatry, or any other the most heinous Crimes, as with either actually Resisting, or so much as once pretending it Lawful, not to say Honourable and Glorious, to resist their lawful Sovereign, though ever so bitter an Enemy to, and Persecutor of themselves, and their Religion. And I am very apt to think that no one who had read these Words in Origen, would have in the least suspected, that Mr. H. would ever have undertaken to represent him as an Advocate for that Resistance he so evidently disavows.

So his Contemporary S. Cyprian proclaims of the Christians of those days, (d) That their Enemies repulsed by their Faith and Courage found plainly, they had resolved to dye rather than suffer themselves to be overcome, nor would so much as once resist those who set upon them,
not

(a) C. Cels. l. 3. p. 115. (b) L. 8. p. 414. (c) Ibid. (d) Ep. 60.

not accounting it consistent with their Duty to destroy those by whom they thus innocently suffered, but that they were rather freely to expose their dearest Hearts Blood, whereby to obtain the quicker Deliverance from the insatiable Malice and Cruelty of their outrageous Adversaries. And even those who had unhappily fallen through surprize or fear, no sooner recovered themselves, but they presently confessed their Guilt, and fortified themselves with Courage and Patience, and stood immovable, in hope of obtaining not only a Pardon for their Fault, but a Crown of Glory by their Sufferings. Where it is observable, that this devout Martyr breaths forth nothing, but an Obligation to be ready upon all occasions, to suffer for the Name of Christ, who had done and suffered so much for them; not one word of standing up for the Publick Safety and Welfare, and to preserve themselves and their Posterity from temporal Ruin. No, all his Aim was to recommend to them a Concern and Care for a better State, and a patient Suffering whatever was necessary in order to it. And again in the same Epistle says he, *Let us offer up our daily Groans, and repeated Prayers; for these (not the Arm of Flesh) are our heavenly Weapons and the Divine Darts that protect us.* And in another (a) Epistle, written to the Presbyters, and Deacons, and the whole Body of his Church, when upon the Proconsul's sending to seize him at Utica, he had been advised to withdraw himself, that he might glorify God by suffering in his own City, and in the face of his Flock, having declared his Expectation in this his Retirement, that the Proconsul would come to Carthage, and there he should hear from him, what the Emperors had decreed concerning the Christians, both Clergy and Laity, and being resolved then freely to speak his Mind, as the Lord should direct him, he gives this Advice, *Vos autem fraires carissimi, &c.* As to you my most dear Brethren, be sure to keep in mind the Doctrine I have always taught you, concerning our Lord's Commands, and as I have in my Preaching continually instructed you, so be ye sure to study, how to live quietly and peaceably, and let none of

of you raise any Tumult amongst the Brethren. And at another time, having taken occasion (a) sadly to bewail the loss of such as had fallen in the Decian Persecution, lamenting it in the sorrowfullest manner with Sighs and Tears, he is yet so far from exciting to have an eye at the temporal Good of the Community, and powerfully and valiantly Resist the Emperor, whereby to prevent the like Insults and Outrages for the future, that he makes no other use of it, but to invite to a serious Reflection upon so great a Misfortune, together with the unhappy Cause of it, and puts them in mind that their Sins had justly deserved all that had befallen them, and much more than Almighty God had yet seen fit to lay upon them; and they ought therefore to look upon what they had been called to suffer, (b) rather as a Tryal of their Faith, than a Persecution for it. Then he proceeds to expose the Heinousness of their Sin, and especially of theirs who took upon them to betray others into it, enquiring into the Causes of it, and shewing how unreasonable it was, that either the loss of their Estates, or the fear, of whatsoever Cruelties might be executed upon them, should rob them of their Integrity, admonishing them moreover of the Divine (c) Judgments that have frequently befallen Apostacy, even in this Life, besides the everlasting Vengeance denounced against them, and to be inflicted upon them in the next; pressing (d) them to a Repentance, and a return from the doleful State whereinto they were fallen; (e) offering to pray to God for them, and urging them to use their Endeavours for capacitating themselves to receive Absolution, begging that both he and they might join together

E

gether

(a) De lapsis, p. 123.

(b) Ut hoc omne quod gestum est, exploratio potius quam persecutio videretur.

(c) Ecce eorum qui negaverant quæ supplicia conspiciamus? quos eorum tristes exitus flemus? Nec hîc esse sine pœnâ possunt, quamvis necdum dies venerit pœnæ.

(d) Quæso vos fratres, acquiescite salubribus remediis: consiliis obedite melioribus, &c.

(e) Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare possimus, &c.

gether in united Groans and Tears, and that in order thereto, having fallen in so dreadful a manner, they would shew an answerable sorrow for it, that (a) the measure of their Repentance might be proportioned to the degree of their Sin; that so deep a Wound might have a suitable Medicine, and a long and deep Humiliation, (b) to pass the Day in Mourning, and the Night in Watching and Weeping, (c) to lie upon the Ground in Ashes and Haircloth and Nastiness, (d) Fasting, and Praying and doing good Works. This is the only Advice *S. Cyprian* gives in those Trying Times, and to such as were sensible how great Temptations they had met with from the Malice of their Persecutors. And if Mr. *H.* can reconcile this with his *Hypothesis*, or can infer any thing from hence in favour of that (e) *Resistance which he has taught to be lawful*, I shall ever own him a Man of singular Ingenuity.

Agreeably hereto (f) *Ensebius* relates the Martyrdom of *Marinus* at *Cæsarea*, about the same time. Which though the Death of a single Person, is yet particularly remarkable upon two accounts; that is to say, upon the account of his own Circumstances and Profession, as being a great Man amongst the Souldiery, and upon account of the Advice and Encouragement given him by *Theotecnus* the Bishop of the place, and who must be supposed to have well understood the Doctrine of those Times in point of Obedience to Governors. He was of an honourable Family, and very rich, and of great Note, and made a very considerable Figure in the Army. But being about to be advanced to yet a higher Station, that of course belonged to him, another who

aim'd

(a) *Quam magna deliquimus, tam granditer defleamus. Alto vulnere diligens & longa medicina non desit; pœnitentia crimine minor non sit.*

(b) *Diem luctu transigere, vigiliis noctes ac fletibus ducere.*

(c) *Stratos solo adhærere cineri, in cilicio & sordibus volutari.*

(d) *Post diaboli cibum malle jejunium: justis operibus incumbere, &c.*

(e) *P. 64.*

(f) *Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 15.*

aim'd at the same Promotion, and had no other Plea for himself, charged *Marinus* with being a Christian, and that he had not sacrificed to the Emperors, and was therefore according to the standing Laws of the Empire, unqualified for such a Command ; and so got him adjudged to death, unless he would renounce his Christianity within the space of three hours. Which coming to the knowledge of *Theotecnus*, he presently sought a liberty of discoursing *Marinus*, and taking him by the hand carried him straightway into the Choir of the Church, and placed him by the (a) Altar, and there pointing on the one hand to his Sword, the token of his Employment, on the other he held out the Holy Bible before him, not to encourage him, as *Mr. H.* would have done, to fight for the Bible, and himself, and his Fellow-Christians, especially considering his Station and Interest in the Army, and the Assistance he might thence have expected, upon such a weighty Occasion ; but on the contrary that he might advise him seriously and deliberately to determin with himself, whether he would resolve to stick to, his Preferment or his Christianity, not so much as in the least intimating, or supposing any other way left him, whereby to take care of himself ; persuading him to hold fast his Bible, and never depart from his God ; assuring him that so he should dye in Peace, and obtain the Crown of Martyrdom, which he knew to be of infinitely greater Concern to him, than his temporal Safety and Welfare. This was the course that good and zealous Bishop recommended, encouraged, and urged him to ; and which *Marinus*, like an unfeigned Disciple of the Blessed *Jesus*, followed accordingly. And he soon found the blessed Effect of it.

Much about the same time, *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, told *Æmilian* the Prefect of *Egypt*, endeavouring to draw him and his Brethren from the Faith, That (b) they worshipped one only God, the Maker of all things, the same that gave the Kingdom to the most holy Emperors *Valerian* and *Gallienus* ; and that they incessantly prayed to

E 2

him,

(a) Ἀγίασμα.

(b) *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 11.*

him, for the Stability and Safety of the Empire. And in an Epistle to Dominus, and Didymus, (a) he complains, That the Christians, Men and Women, young and old of both Sexes, Souldiers and private Persons, of all Conditions and all Ages, were whipt to Death, were burnt in the Fire, were slain with the Sword ; yet never in the least intimates any inclination in them, to stand up in their own Defence, against such as treated them thus barbarously. There were no Mr. H's. amongst the Christians of those days, to stir them up to Resist their Prince ; but they considered rather that all their Sufferings were in order to a Crown of Glory, which they most earnestly desired to attain to.

Consonantly whereto in the next Age, Lactantius speaking of Religion, teaches, That (b) it is to be defended, not by Fighting, but by Dying for it ; not by Cruelty, but by Patience ; not by Wickedness, but by Trust in God, and Reliance upon him ; the former being the way of Bad, the other of Good Men. And soon after, (c) When we suffer so dreadfully, we do not so much as return ill Language for it, but leave it to God to avenge our Sufferings.

So Gregory Nazianzen having complained of the ill Designs of the Apostate Julian against the Christians, and that he had not only renounced their Religion, but had set himself by all means possible to destroy and extirpate it, insomuch that (d) neither Dioclesian, who, as he expresses it, (e) first set himself to reproach the Christians, nor Maximinian, who came after, and exceeded him, had ever thought of, nor Maximin, more cruel and barbarous than either of these ; he subjoins, These things he had been contriving with himself, as some of his most intimate Confidants have owned ; ἐπεχέειν δὲ, but he was prevented by the Favour of God, and the Tears of the Christians plentifully shed upon this occasion, τὸ το μόνον ἐχόντων κατὰ τὴ διώκῃ φαίσε-
μακρον, this being the only Remedy they were allowed against the

(a) Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 11.

(b) Instit. l. 5. c. 20.

(c) C. 21.

(d) ΣΤΗΛΙΤΔΤ. α. p. 57.

(e) Πρῶτος ἐχὼ πάντων ἡμῶν διωξάντων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸς ἡμῶν ἐκείνων διωγμῶν. Ἐξ c. Schol. in loc.

the Persecutor. And at another time, he exhorts (a) to continue faithful to Kings, but especially to Almighty God, and for his sake, (not only for the sake of Publick Good) to such as are put in Authority under him. And (b) he recommends it as a laudable Statute of our Religion, that we are required to be subject to all Higher Powers, as Servants are to be to their Masters, Wives to their Husbands, the Church to its Lord, and Disciples to their Pastors and Teachers.

S. Ambrose, who lived at the same time with him, discoursing of those Words of David, *Against Thee only have I sinned, and done this Evil in thy sight*, gives this Reason of the Restriction, (c) *Rex utiq; erat, nullis ipse legibus tenebatur*; Being a King, he was punishable by no Human Laws; inasmuch as Kings are free from the Bonds of their Offences. For no Laws can require them to be punished, because the Power of their Command protects them against it. And if in his judgment not punishable by Law, then certainly not punishable by their own Subjects without, and against Law. And treating of the Doctrine of S. Paul, (d) he affirms, *These Words, He that resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, to be levelled against such as trust to their own Strength, thinking themselves out of danger of being brought to account for their Disobedience, and hope by this means to escape the Law.* The Apostle, says he, informs such, that God's Law is not to be evaded; but howsoever they may escape for a while, the Judgment of God will most certainly overtake them at the last. And when the Emperor *Valentinian* the younger had been prevailed upon, at the instance of his Mother *Justina*, to yield that two of the Churches at *Milain* should be delivered to the *Arians*, and this holy Man was required to deliver them accordingly; he pleaded for himself the Unlawfulness of doing it, and that therefore he could by no means comply. But however he professed, he would readily submit (e) wherever he

E 3

could;

(a) Orat. 27. p. 471.

(b) Orat. 17. p. 270.

(d) In Rom. 13. 2.

(c) In Psal. 50.

(e) L. 2. Epist. 14.

could ; and if the Emperor should think fit to demand whatever he had of his own, he would not refuse to surrender it ; and if he were to be imprisoned, or put to death, he would not oppose it ; and commended his People for their Patience and Quietness under such a Trial. *For what, says he, could be spoken better by Christians, than what the Holy Ghost has spoken in you to day ? Rogamus, Auguste, non pugnamus. Non timemus, sed rogamus. We beseech thee, O Emperor, we do not fight against thee. We do not fear how thou mayst use us, but we beseech thee to hearken to us. Thus it becomes Christians to desire the continuance of Peace and Faith, and to persevere in the Truth, though when in danger of dying for it. And when he understood the Soldiers had actually taken possession of the Church, he fetcht a deep Sigh, and said to those who would have persuaded him to go thither, Tradere Basilicam non possum ; sed repugnare non debeo : I cannot deliver up the Church ; but yet I must not seek to preserve it by Resistance. I do not know how far Mr. H. can contrive to interpret these Passages of S. Ambrose in favour of Resistance ; but all the World besides, must own them to be diametrically opposite to all Attempts of that nature.*

And so is what follows out of his Contemporary Gregory Nyssen ; who speaking of the Emperor, expresses himself in this manner. (a) *We call him his own Lord, and say, he has no Lord over him, but is Ruler over all the People. Nor is it any Lye to say concerning him, that the name of King denotes a freedom from a superior Lord. Nor do we own any necessity, that if this Word be understood to mean one's being his own Lord, and under no other's Dominion, it should therefore no longer imply an Authority over the Subjects. For the name of Empire, or Kingdom, being of a middle Signification between these two, imports partly a Freedom from any other Lord, and partly a Dominion over others. Where he manifestly declares the Prince to be ἀνάκτορον, without any Superior upon Earth, and consequently unaccountable to all but God Almighty, and*
in

in particular to be so in respect to his own Subjects.

I have a little before observed what account S. Ambrose gives of David's Confession to God, *Tibi soli peccavi; Against Thee only have I sinned*; And here I must add that S. Jerome gives the same Reason of that Expression, *Rex erat, & alium non timebat*; Being a King, he had none to fear but God; as much as to say, that God only had the Power of calling Kings to account, and therefore not their own People.

Optatus Milevitanus reprehends *Donatus*, for his undutiful carriage towards the Emperor, in contradiction to S. Paul's Doctrine, and charges him with (a) *Studying to do wrong to sovereign Powers, for whom, would he have hearkened to the Apostle, he would have taught him to pray daily. For so he required in his first Epistle to Timothy: Pray for Kings and Powers, that under them we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life. And this, says the Apostle, ought to be done, etiam si talis esset Imperator qui gentilitur vivit, though the Emperor were a Heathen; how much more then, when he is a Christian, a fearer of God, religious, and merciful?* I doubt not but Mr. H. will own Obedience and even Non-resistance is due to such a Sovereign thus qualified for the promotion of God's Service, and his People's Good. But if he pleases to look back to the Words immediately before, he will see this Submission and these Prayers are owing not only to a Christian, pious, religious, and merciful Prince, but to one that should live as do the Heathens. And not only so, but if he should be a malicious and persecuting Heathen, an Enemy to and Hater of the true Religion, or how ill soever qualified, he presently subjoins a Reason, that shews it unlawful to resist even such a Governor. (b) *Cum super Imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem*; namely, That the Emperor has none above him but God alone, who made him Emperor; or in other Words, He is answerable for his Misgovernment to no one, but God himself, who is his only Superior, and

E 4

from

(a) C. Parmen. l. 3. p. 66,

(b) P. 67.

from whom he received his Commission and Authority;

That there is no Power but of God, says S. Augustin, (a) is testified by the Mouth of Wisdom, By me Kings reign, and by me Tyrants possess the Earth. So also says the Apostle, There is no Power but of God. And that it is highly reasonable it should be so, is taught in the Book of Job; Who setteth a Hypocrite to reign, because of the Wickedness of the People. And concerning the People of Israel saith God, I gave them a King in my Wrath. For there is no injustice in wicked Mens receiving a Power to do Mischief, to the end, that the Patience of good Men may manifest it self, and the Iniquity of the Wicked may be punished. For by the Power given to the Devil Job was tried, that he might appear Righteous; Peter was tempted, that he might not presume upon his own Strength, Paul was buffeted, lest he should be exalted above measure; and Judas was condemned, that he might hang himself. And upon another occasion. says he, (b) A Man should not disdain to serve even a bad Master, heartily, and willingly, and lovingly; adding withal, that what he spake concerning the Master and Servant, was to be understood in like manner concerning the Powers and Kings, and all that are in the high places of this World. And at another time he asks, (c) Quid ergo? Eos Christiani offenderunt? How is it then? Have the Christians done any thing to offend them? Have they not performed their Duty to them? Wherein is it that the Christians have failed of their Obedience to the Kings of the Earth? Hence it evidently appears, that their Persecutions are without Cause. But mark what follows: And my Heart was afraid because of thy Word. They likewise had threatening Words, I drive you out, I banish you, I rake you with iron Claws, I roast you with Fires, I deliver you up to the Fury of the Beasts, I tear you limb from limb. But thy Words have terrified me abundantly beyond all this. "Fear not those who kill the Body, and after that have nothing more that they can do; but fear him who has power to cast both Soul and Body into Hell." Sure S. Augustin

(a) De nat. boni, c. Manich. c. 32.

(b) Enarr. in Psal. 124.

(c) In Psal. 118.

fin did not think (d) a *Passive Nonresistance* would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary. All his care was to fortify the Soul for patient Suffering, that it might not be endanger'd by the Insults and Threats of such, whose utmost Rage could reach no farther than this Life. But as for the temporal Welfare of themselves and their Posterity, though a very valuable Blessing, this he thought of so little concern in comparison of their eternal Salvation, that he takes no manner of notice of it. So far was he from directing to this as their end, or inviting to resist their tyrannical and disorderly Governors in order to it. The natural Inference from these Words, is, that a good Christian, such as S. *Augustin* was, and such as he speaks of in this place, will chuse quietly and patiently to submit to the utmost Severities of his persecuting Sovereign, rather than provoke Almighty God against his own Soul, which were the only two ways he thought them like to deliberate about; for he never in the least suspects them to have had any thought of flying to Arms against their persecuting Princes.

The next I shall mention is S. *Chrysostom*, who lived as S. *Augustin* did in the latter part of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth Century. Who speaking of the Civil Governor, affirms, (e) that *whosoever is not obedient to him, fights against God, who has enjoined Submission to him.* And a little after, he in other words presses the same Duty, and from the same Consideration of God's Injunction in the case, together with the Vengeance he has threatned to the refractory and disobedient. *Be not ashamed therefore, saith the Apostle, of such Subjection, for the Law of God requires it; and he will be a severe Revenger of the Indignities offered to his Ministers; as whosoever disobeys them, will find to his cost. For he shall not be punished with any common Punishment, but with such as is exceedingly sharp. Nor shall any thing secure him from being called to a severe account by Man, besides that he provokes Almighty God, in a peculiar manner, against his own Soul.* And upon

(d) *Measures of Submission*, p. 8. (e) *In Rom.* 13. 2.

on another occasion, instead of exclaiming against the Emperor's Cruelty and Rage, and inviting his Subjects to arm in their own Defence, he takes a quite contrary course, such as Mr. *H.* would never have advised to, lest so the Community and their Posterity after them, should be utterly undone by it. (e) *Let us prostrate ourselves, says he, at the Emperor's Feet, or rather let us beseech our good and gracious God, to assuage the Emperor's Fury, and render him propitious to us.* And commending David's Carriage towards Saul, his causeless, yet implacable Enemy, he represents him, thus expressing his sense of Duty to him, (f) *that though he could not admire his manner of Life, nor boast of his good Deeds, he considered in what an honourable Station God had set him, that he was his Anointed, and therefore reasoned thus in his favour; Why say you he is a most abominable King, guilty of great Irregularities, and my own Enemy to the last degree? Remember he is however my King, he is my Prince, and God has given him Authority over me. He did not say, he was his King only, but he was the Lord's Anointed; laying a greater weight upon the Honour he had received from above, than on that which was done him by his Subjects here below.* After which he cautions to observe this following Admonition; *Thou despisest thy Fellow-Servant, yet see thou reverence him as he is thy Lord; and if thou hast no regard for him who is ordained to this high Office, at least have some for him who has ordained him. For if we fear, and stand in awe of those Rulers who are appointed by the King, though Evil, Robbers, Unjust, or howsoever otherwise ill inclin'd, not despising them for their bad quality, but respecting them for the worth of the Sovereign who has appointed them, how much rather ought this to be done where Almighty God has himself appointed them?* And again he professes of David, (g) *God crowned his right hand, for being able to keep its Sword clean, and not died with Blood; he came out of the Cave, not with Saul's Crown upon his Head, but adorned with a Crown of Righteousness; not cloathed with a purple Royal Robe,*

(e) Orat. in Eutrop. To. 8. p. 70.

(f) Orat. 1. εἰς τὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Σαῦλ.

(g) Orat. 2. εἰς τὸ Δαβ. καὶ τὸ Σα.

Robe. but with a more than humane Meekness, brighter than all the finest Garments, and with greater Lustre than the three Children out of the Furnace. And again, (h) when he could have slain him that lay in wait for him, yet for God's sake he would not, but chose to live every day in Danger, rather than be delivered from so many Deaths, by slaying him who had deserved so ill of him. Thus clearly was S. Chrysostom for suffering from time to time, and enduring all outward Inconveniencies and Indignities, all Perils and Dangers from a wicked and malicious King, without making any allowance for resisting him, though in order to the Welfare of the Publick, which had a particular Relation to, and Dependance upon David's Escape and Safety.

Whereto may be added those Sayings of Synesius, in (a) an Epistle written against Andronicus Prefect of Egypt, and a severe Enemy to the Christians; where he reckons bad and destructive Princes to be Scourges in God's hand, for the Chastisement of a sinful People. For thus he speaks, "Ὅταν οὖν δεῖται κολασῶν, &c. When he has occasion for some to punish those that have offended him, sometimes he makes use of such Demons as have the Command over Swarms of Locusts, sometimes those that cause the Pestilence; and at one time a barbarous Nation, at another a wicked King; and in a word, such Instruments as are fitted by nature to do Mischief. He likewise complains how ill the Christians at Pentapolis were used by this Andronicus, so that through all the Forum was heard the doleful Sound of Men groaning, Women lamenting, Children crying; and the whole City looked as if just taken by an Enemy, the chief and best part of it being set apart for the Exercise of his Cruelties, and the Royal Portico, formerly the Seat of Judgment, turn'd into a place of Execution. Yet did not the Citizens sound to Arms, they raised no Forces against so implacable, so merciless a Governor, but fell to their Prayers. And as for himself, he professes that he was little concerned for any Indignity that was offered

(h) Orat. 3. εἰς τὸ Δαβ. καὶ τὸ Σ.

(a) Epist. 57.

(b) Ibid. p. 196. & Epist. 69.

offered, or Violence that was done him; but rather gave thanks for it, remembring that it came from God's hand, and esteeming it as a sort of Martyrdom. Such a Sense had he of the Obligation he was under, to submit and attend to God's Correction, when coming by the Management of an Imperious and Wicked Ruler. He very well knew it became him to bear the Rod, and him that had appointed it; and to leave the consequence, as to the things of this World, to him who made and governs it, and will cause all to work together for good to them that love him. And accordingly when this same *Andronicus* (i) had behaved himself so insolently and impiously against our blessed Lord, and had harassed the Christians most intolerably, abusing the Priests of God so excessively, as neither *Phalaris* of *Agragas*, nor *Cephren* the Egyptian, nor the *Babylonian Senacherib* who sent to reproach the God of the *Jews*, would have dared to do, yet did they use no other than Spiritual Weapons against him. The Bishops met and pronounced him excommunicate, and to be look'd upon by all, and avoided, as such. And this was all the Opposition they made to him, though so outrageous an Adversary to their Lord, their Religion, and themselves.

I shall name but one more, and that is *Prosper Aquitanicus*, who lived also in this fifth Century; and expressly declares, that (k) *no Power is to be slighted by the Followers of the meek and holy Jesus, that Obedience is due from them to Kings, as well as Masters*, and that it is honourable and glorious, not to rise up against such of them as are Enemies to the publick Happiness, but *as to love those that are Good, so also patiently to bear with the Bad*. He knew as the poor persecuted Christians had found by long Experience, that Wicked and unjust Governors were frequently to be expected, as the State of this World is, wherein the Bad

of

(i) Epist. 58.

(k) *Mitibus & sanctis nulla est spernenda potestas :
Æquum servire est Regibus & Dominis.*

Ut Christi famulis ad verum profit honorem,
Dilexisse bonos, & tolerasse malos.

Epigr. 34. De obsequiis debitis.

of all sorts are so much more numerous than the Good. But he, as well as those others before mentioned, was wholly unacquainted with Mr. *H*'s new Doctrine, that (1) *supposing it true that Governors act contrary to the end of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the ruine of the Society over which they are placed; it is lawful and glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.* He had not learn'd this new Doctrine, I say, a Doctrine not then known to Christians, and which had it been broached by any Innovator, would, we may be sure, have been rejected with the utmost Indignation.

I have now gone through the four first Ages of the Church, and half the fifth; and need proceed no farther, these Instances hitherto alledged, being enough to shew beyond all Contradiction, what the Christians of these several Ages believed, and taught, as to the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and under what Obligations they thought themselves upon all Occasions to the Practice of it. They exhorted to fear the King as God's Ordinance, and not to resist him upon any account. They gloried in being the best of Subjects, and professed themselves to pray for the Safety and Welfare of the Emperors, and their Posterity, and of the whole Empire; duly paying their Tributes, acknowledging them not only to be constituted by God, but to be less than him only, next to him, above all Men living, and so accountable to none of them; loving, honouring, reverencing them, and allowing of no other Weapons against them but Prayers and Tears; beseeching, not arming against, nor ever daring to revenge themselves upon their sharpest Persecutors; but choosing freely to die, that they might the sooner be delivered from the Malice of their Adversaries, and enstated in the Glories of the other World; advising their Brethren to be quiet, and do their own Business, and upon no account to raise any Tumults or Commotions, but to prefer their

In-

(1) *Measures of Submission*, p. 40.

Integrity before their Lives, or any thing they could enjoy or hope for here, and to endeavour the Defence of their Religion, not by Fighting, Injustice, or any kind of Wickedness, but by Patience, by Meekness, by Submission, by Resignation of themselves to the Divine Will, and if necessary, by laying down their Lives in obedience to it; looking upon the Opposers of those in Authority, as Fighters against God, who has commanded Submission and Obedience as the Subjects Duty, and will severely punish such as take a contrary course, though with ever so good a Design and Intent, and though supposed to tend ever so much to the Advantage of the Society. They were perfect Strangers to Mr. H's Doctrine of *Resistance in some Cases*, and inculcated the contrary Duty of Subjection, but never perswaded to take up Arms against their Sovereign. This was their Doctrine. And that their Practice was answerable to it, and they did not impose upon others, what they were not willing to perform themselves, is what I come now to shew, But that will be the business of the next Section.

S E C T. II.

What the Practice of the Primitive Christians was in the Point of Obedience to Governors.

HERE I am to shew, as I have just now intimated, that these sincere, devout, and truly religious Followers of our Lord, did not *lay heavy Burdens upon others, which themselves would not move with one of their Fingers*. They did not call upon others to submit to their cruel, persecuting Governors, and refuse to do it themselves when called to it; but were forward enough upon every occasion to set themselves a Pattern of what they taught, to the great Surprise and Astonishment of the Beholders, and even of their most bitter Enemies. Neither Reproaches, nor Affronts, nor Confinements, nor Racks and Tortures, nor Confiscation of Goods, nor Death in all its most dismal Shapes, could in any wise tempt them to resist their lawful Superiours. Such a *Fear* had they of God
and

and the King, that they durst shew themselves undutiful, and disobedient to neither of them; but studied rather to mitigate the Fury of their Persecutors, by a submissive and respectful, and quiet Behaviour towards them, under all the ill Usage they met with. They kept in mind the Doctrine of their Religion, and the Example of their blessed Lord, who *was made perfect by Sufferings*; and could not but reflect and be sensible how ill Resistance in any case became the Disciples of so meek and passive a Master. And they were so far from venturing upon it, whatsoever Provocation they had to it, that they were all along most signally remarkable for their unshaken Fidelity and Loyalty to all their Princes. More particularly,

I. They were careful to pray for their Governors, tho' Enemies to, and Persecutors of themselves and their Religion, which was dearer to them than all the things in this World. They knew they were commanded, to (a) *pray for Kings and all in Authority*, and accordingly they shewed themselves ready to perform this truly Christian Office, for the Emperors, and other inferiour Governors, as God had given them in charge. This I have already shewn in part, from what I have cited out of *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus Antiochensis*, *Dionysius*, and *Optatus*. We pray for you, says *Justin Martyr* to *Antoninus Pius* and his Sons, that together with your Royal Power, you may enjoy a sound Mind. We pray for you, says *Athenagoras* to *Marcus Antoninus* and his Son *Commodus*, that the Son may succeed his Father, as is most just, and that your Government may be extended far and near. I will honour the King, says *Theophilus*, not worshipping him, but praying for him. We, says *Dionysius*, pray to the one God for the Emperors *Valerian* and *Gallienus*, and for the Stability and Safety of their Empire. And *Optatus* cites *S. Paul* teaching to pray for Kings and Powers, that with them we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life.

And before all these, *Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna*, and a glorious Martyr for the Faith, writing to the *Philippians*, gives

gives them this Charge, (a) *Pray for all the Saints, pray also for Kings, and Powers, and Princes, and for them that persecute you, and hate you, and are Enemies to the Cross of Christ; that your fruit may be made manifest amongst all, and that you may be perfect in him.*

And the Story of the (b) *Thundring Legion* is well attested, (c) who prayed for the Emperor *M. Antoninus* in his great Streight, when his whole Army were like to perish with Thirst for five days, and immediately obtained from God a cool refreshing Shower upon themselves and their Army, and a Storm of Hail and Fire upon their Enemies.

We pray for all Emperors, says Tertullian, (d) that God would be pleased to grant them a long Life, and a quiet Reign, that their Family may be safe, and their Forces Valiant, that their Senate may be faithful, and their People orderly and virtuous, that they may rule in Peace, and have all the Blessings they can desire, either as Men or Emperors. So likewise says he, (e) We pray for the Emperors, and for their Ministers, and all in Authority under them, for the Happiness of the State, for the Peace of the Empire, and for its lasting Continuance. And again, (f) We sacrifice for the Safety of the Emperor, but to our God, and his, and as we are commanded, with unfeigned Prayer. And presently after, (g) We pray the more earnestly for the Emperor's Safety, beseeching him who can grant us our Petitions.

Eusebius likewise tells us, of the Emperor Gallus, the Successor of Decius, That (h) he was very cruel to those holy and religious Men, meaning the Christians, who earnestly besought Almighty God for the Peace of his Empire, and the Safety of his Life, thereby rendring all their Prayers for him ineffectual. Which is another illustrious Instance, of the Christians continuing to supplicate Almighty God, in behalf not of their good Governors only,

(a) Edit. Oxon. p. 60.

(b) Κεραυρόβολος. Xiph. in vit. Mar. Antonini.

(c) Just. Mart. Apol. 2. in fine. Tertull. Apol. c. 5. & ad Scap. c. 4.

(d) Apol. c. 30. (e) c. 39. (f) Ad Scap. c. 2. (g) Ibid.

(h) Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 1.

ly; but of those that were professed Enemies to their Religion, and to themselves because of it. And Mr. H. cannot say of such; that they were good Governors, and true Promoters of the Welfare and Happiness of the Society over whom they were set.

To the same purpose pleads *Arnobius*, (b) *How have the Scriptures deserved to be burnt? or the places of our Assemblies to be furiously pulled down? in which the most High God is prayed to, and Peace and Pardon is requested for all, and in particular for our Magistrates, Armies and Kings.*

So *S. Athanasius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his Apology to the *Arian* Emperor *Constantius*, (c) mentions it as a thing taken for granted, that he did not cease to pray for the Welfare of his Sovereign. And a few Lines after he pleads for himself, That he did pray for his Safety; and for the truth and certainty of this, calls upon the Lord to attest it, *who*, says he, *has heard me, and has granted you the whole Empire, as it descended from your Ancestors.* In like manner he appeals to *Philecesimus* President of *Egypt*, and *Raffinus* the Treasurer, and *Stephen* the Controulor, and *Asterius* the Provost, and *Palladius* Master of the Palace, and *Antiochus* and *Evangrius* Superintendents, that he said only, *Εὐχόμεθα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας Αὐγύστου Κωνσταντοῦ*, Let us pray for the Safety of the Emperor *Constantius*, and that all the People cried out with one Voice, *Χριστέ βοήθει Κωνσταντῷ*, O Christ help *Constantius*, and so continued praying for a time. Here we have a great Bishop and his People, offering up their Supplications and Intercessions for their Sovereign, not a true, sound, orthodox Christian; nor a Friend to those that were so, but a professed *Arian*, and a Zealous Promoter of that Heresy, and an irreconcilable Enemy to the better sort of Christians.

And *Cyri] of Jerusalem* giving an account of the Worship of the Christians in his time, amongst other particulars mentions this, That after the spiritual Sacrifice finished, (d) *we beseech God for the common Peace of all*
F
the

(b) *Adv. Gentes. l. 4. in fine.*

(c) *Πῶς ἐκ ὑπὲρ οἷς σωτηρίας ἐχόμεθα*; *Ad Imp. Const. Apol. p. 679.*

(d) *Catech. Myst. 5. n. 6.*

the Churches, for the good Estate of the World, for Kings and their Soldiers and Allies.

Nor do I know any instance of their refusing to proceed in this manner, but only in the case of *Julian* the Apostate, and this only at *Nazianzum*, and not till he had renounced Christianity, and initiated himself in Magick and Dæmonolatry, to that degree that they might perhaps conclude him to have committed the unpardonable Sin. As has been shewn at large by the learned Author of *Jovian*, chap. VI. p. 137, &c. Whither therefore I refer the Reader.

It were easy to heap up Instances to testify the Fidelity of the Christians in this respect, and their Zeal for their Sovereign's Welfare, though when far enough from being such as Mr. *H.* thinks the Ministers of God must necessarily be, unless they will divest themselves of all their Authority, and leave their Subjects at liberty to withdraw their Allegiance, and seek for others to supply their places; but I forbear. These few already mentioned are enough to shew, that this was one branch of that Duty, which was paid by the primitive Christians to their Princes. And though they speak here only of Praying for the Emperors and other Governors, and nothing directly against Resisting them, yet I cannot but think this a very good, a substantial, and unanswerable Argument against Resistance, and such as Mr. *H.* will not easily be able to reply to, if he please but duly to consider, what holy and devout Servants of God these were, and will be so kind, or so just to them, as not to charge them with the grossest Hypocrisy, in putting up these Prayers for the Happiness, the Prosperity and Safety of their Governors, and at the same time looking upon it as their Duty, not to bear with their Faults, and submit to their unjust Proceedings, but to rise up against them, and take the first opportunity of deposing them. As according to Mr. *H.* they ought to have done by most of them.

II. They willingly submitted to the hardest Usage they met with, from their merciless and persecuting Emperors. None that is in the least acquainted with the History

History of those Times, but must needs be sensible how they were harassed from time to time, and from place to place, what horrid Cruelties and Barbarities they underwent, and what vast Numbers of them chose rather to dye, whatever sorts of Death, than violate the Laws of their Religion, either by an undue Compliance with the sinful Commands of their Superiours, or by rising in their own Defence against them.

The very Heathens could advise (e) To look upon Governors as sent by God, and those that were bad amongst them as a Judgment from God, and (f) to receive their Lusts and Avarice with the same Patience and Submission to the Divine Will, *as Men do the Barrenness of the Earth, or excessive Rains, or other the like Calamities, considering that so long as Kings are but Men, they will have their Faults as well as others; but withal that the Case will not last the same always, but a change may come, that may prove a sufficient compensation for what they had endured.* And we may be sure, these faithful Disciples of our Lord were not less resigned, or less ready to bear all that at any time was laid upon them, with a quiet and contented Mind, referring themselves, and all their concerns, to the Divine Disposal. They acted like Persons, whose *Conversation* was really in Heaven, and could despise all things here below, as not worthy to be compared with the Glories that shall hereafter be revealed; looking not at the things which are seen, and are temporal, but at those which are not seen, and are eternal. We have large accounts of their Martyrdoms; but none at all of their Rebellions, though many times under the greatest Temptations, that the Fury of their enraged Adversaries could administer. Who can tell, says S. Augustin, (g) *what multitudes chose rather to dye the cruellest Deaths,*

F 2

than

(e) Ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες ἐπεὶ, Διὸς ὅδ' ἐν ἀνθρώπων Θεοῖσι πρῶτον, ἔσ' c. Callimach. Hymn. in Jovem.

(f) Quomodo sterilitatem, aut nimios imbres, & cætera naturæ mala; ita luxum vel avaritiam Dominantium tolerare. Vitia erunt donec homines. Sed neq; hæc continua; & meliorum interventu pensantur. Cerealis apud Tacit. Hist. l. 4.

(g) De civ. Dei. l. 22. c. 6.

than deny Christ to be God? The Safety of the City of God, as he adds a little after, is such as may be preserved, or rather procured, together with, and by means of their Faithfulness; but this being once lost, they must expect no more Profelytes to come over to them. And this Thought well fixed in their steady and patient Minds, was the occasion of so many, and such glorious Martyrs. And in his Comment upon the 118th Psalm, he puts these Questions, (b) *Nonne præcepit, &c.* Has not he, our Lord and Master, commanded his Church to pray for Kings? How is it then? Can they charge the Christians with having any way offended them? What Dues have they not paid? Wherein have they not been obedient to the Kings of the Earth? Is it not therefore without any cause on their part, that they are so persecuted by them? with more to the same purpose, as I have noted before.

Some, says Tertullian, (i) underwent the tryal of the Sword, some of the Fire, some of the Beasts. Some in the mean time were Bastinadoed, and torn with (k) Iron-claws, and yet still kept in Prison, and not dispatcht out of the World. At another time, (l) They were stript of their Honours, and not only those of lower Station, but even the principal Men of the City, those who were of the first Rank, and every way best accomplished amongst them, were put to the Rack upon the slightest accounts, were Crucified, (m) or else were laid in Irons; besides that they had their Wives taken from them, and forced into the Seraglio. (n) They were Whipt in a more infamous and painful manner than Slaves had wont to be, were delivered up to the Beasts, to be swallowed down, rather than eaten by them. Whilst those who had no Dignity to lose, were condemned to the Flames, and sometimes were leisurely scorched with slow Fires, so that the Soles of their Feet were first parched till the Flesh was shrunk
up

(b) To. 8. p. 968.

(i) Scorpiac. c. 1.

(k) *Ungulæ erant instrumenta ferrea, quæ ungues avium referebant; unde & id nomen acceperunt; quibus laniabantur homines ut plurimum in equuleo extenti, &c. Gish. Cuper. in Lactant. de Mortibus Persecutorum. c. 16.*

(l) Lact. de Mort. Pers. c. 21.

(m) B. Cyprian. Ep. 39.

(n) Ibid.

up, and at length fell from the Bones. There were Torches lighted and put out again, and so applied to their several Parts, that nothing of them might be free. And during these Barbarities, to prolong their Misery, they had cold Water thrown in their Faces, and some given them to moisten their Mouths, that they might not be presently choaked; till their Skin being at length quite consumed, the force of the Fire made its way to their Vitals. And after this, when quite worn out, though they were burnt to Ashes upon a Pile prepared for that purpose, yet their Bones or any thing that remained of them, were not allowed to be interred, but were beaten to powder, and cast into some River or Sea. (o) Great Numbers of them were every day publicly Roasted, Crucified, Beheaded, though guilty of no Crime, nor liable to any other Charge but only that they were Christians. (p) All kinds of Punishments and Torments were invented for them, Pans to fry them, Slings to shoot them, Caldrons to boil them, Chimneys to burn them, Lakes to drown them, Precipices whence to cast them down, Teeth of Beasts to devour them, Seas to drown them, distant Places whereto to banish them, not to mention other innumerable Instruments of Torture, *ὡς δὲ λόγῳ ἔντα, ὡς δὲ ἔργῳ φανερά*, says S. Chrysostom, such as were neither to be expressed by Words, nor in any measure tolerable, that is to say, in Lactantius's Language, (q) such as no Patience, but which was divinely inspired, could overcome. Which yet the same Lactantius tells us, (r) They endured without any manner of complaint, [much more without any thoughts of Resistance] with a happy and invincible Submission, that deservedly astonished all the People, and all the Provinces, and their hard-hearted Executioners themselves, who could not but be surprized to see their greatest Cruelties conquered by a greater Patience.

In like manner Eusebius relates of them, (s) That they bore all sorts of Reproach and Punishment, making light of them all, in comparison of the Glory that was to follow,

F 3

esteeming

(o) Just. M. c. Tryph. & Clem. Alexandr. Strom. l. 2.

(p) B. Chrysost. c. Judæos. (q) L. 5. c. 13. (r) L. 6. c. 17.

(s) Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1. & l. 8. c. 6. & de Laud. Constan.

esteeming their Sufferings for their Religion, and even the several kinds of Death they were put to, as highly preferable to all the Splendor and Delights of this Life.

In short, they rejoiced in a conformity to the Pattern their blessed Saviour had set them; and like him were brought as Sheep to the Slaughter, and even to the most inhuman and terrible sorts of it, (r) *μνηστέρι δὲ ἀμυνάδῃ* *ἐπὶ τῇ ἡσυχίᾳ τὰς διώκοντας*, without ever imagining themselves at liberty to resist their Persecutors. They were (u) put to the Sword, were hung upon Crosses, were sawn asunder, were whipt to death, were buried alive, were pulled in pieces by wild Beasts, were starved in Prison, were condemned to the Mines, (x) suffered Loss of all they had, (y) were Flead, (z) were Roasted, (a) were Broiled, were Empaled, were Beheaded, (b) and at last were left unburied. Thus (c) multitudes of them were served every day, and as I said before, (d) not for any Crime they had been guilty of, but purely for their Religion sake, and because they professed themselves Christians. Yet all this while they breathed forth nothing but Patience, and Contentment, and Resignation to the Divine Will, and a Hope and Desire of a better State, and of all that Bliss and Glory, which is promised in the other World, to such as love and fear God.

And dares Mr. H. blame them for such their submissive and truly Christian Deportment, under all their severest Trials, for which their Memory has been ever since deservedly admired and honoured upon Earth, and themselves glorified in Heaven? Dares he charge it as a Sin upon these Holy, and Devout, truly Pious, and Heavenly Souls, that they had too little regard for this World, and too much for the other; and that it was an

(r) Orig. c. Cell. l. 3. p. 115.

(u) Just. M. c. Tryph. B. Chrysof. c. Jud. l. 2. Euseb. H. E. l. 8. c. 7, 8, &c. B. Gregor. Exposit. moral. l. 32. c. 12.

(x) B. Cyprian. de lapsis.

(y) B. Cypr. epist. 58.

(z) Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 2.

(a) Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 15. Prudent. Peristeph. Hymn. 3, and 10.

(b) Alteserr. in Anastas. p. 18.

(c) Clem. Alex. str. l. 2. p. 414.

(d) Id. l. 4. p. 505.

an unpardonable Error in them, to seek, by *losing their Lives here for their Saviour's sake, to save them to all Eternity hereafter*? Dares he upon second Thoughts undertake, to censure them, as not standing up for the Rights and Liberties of Mankind, but betraying the Privileges, giving up the Safety, and ruining the Happiness of the Society they belonged to, both for the present and for succeeding Generations? It is most certain that (a) no Cominations, or Seditions, no Rebellion, or Resistance of Authority was either begun, or promoted by them, how *contrary* soever their Governors acted to the End of their Institution, and how unmercifully soever they invaded the Rights of their Subjects, and attempted the Ruin of the Society over which they were placed. These Subjects did not think it lawful to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governors; but that this was the wrong way to promote the Publick Happiness, and it was their Duty, and Glorious for them, to suffer patiently all their Oppressions, and depend upon God's good Providence for the Happiness of Human Society, in whose Power alone it was to preserve it. And if Mr. H. will condemn them for this, he must at the same time condemn our Blessed Lord himself, whose Pattern they set themselves to follow, his Gospel which required it of them, and his Apostles who instilled these Notions into them. But this is not all.

III. As their Sufferings were Excessive in themselves, so to add to the weight of them, they were in many cases without so much as a Pretence of Law. This I confess is not so directly against Mr. H. who affirms, as I have formerly observed, (b) *That should all who are possessed of Power, in any Form of Government, consent and agree to enslave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and make them miserable, there is nothing in Nature, or in the Christian Religion, that can hinder the People from redressing their Grievances, and from answering the Will of*

F 4

Al-

(a) Οὐδὲν γὰρ σώσεως ἔργον ἐπιδείξαι χριστιανῶν ὁ Κέλσος καὶ οἱ ὁμονοῦντες αὐτῷ δυνάμει. Orig. c. Cels. l. 3. p. 115.

(b) Part. I. p. 144.

Almighty God, so far as to preserve, and secure the Happiness of the Publick Society. For according to him it signifies little, whether a Prince persecutes, or any way wrongs his Subjects by, or without Law. Yet because his Predecessor *Sa. Johnson*, and others of the same Stamp, have made a wide difference betwixt our Case, and that of the Primitive Christians, purely upon this account, namely, Because there was a Law of the Empire, which is still contained in the Fragments we have remaining of the XII Tables, (a) That forbids so much as privately to Worship any *New, or Foreign Gods*, till publickly received, or as (b) *Tertullian* represents it, till approved of by the Senate, and so the Persecutions of the Christians were supposed to have been according to the Laws of the Empire, and this to have been the only Reason of their Non-resistance; whereas if we be persecuted for our Religion, or have our Rights any way invaded by the Prince, each of these must be against Law, and we are therefore not obliged to submit to such illegal usage, any longer than till an opportunity offers itself for setting ourselves free; this, I say, being insisted on as a vast difference betwixt our own Case, and that of the Primitive Christians in the *Roman Empire*, that we have the Laws of our side, but the Laws were against them; I shall therefore apply myself to shew, that this is not a true state of the Case, and that these holy Disciples of our Lord, were not only persecuted

(a) Separatim nemo habessit Deos néve novos: sed ne advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto. lib. 1. Qui colendi. Which *Pamelius* in his Notes upon *Tertullian's Apologetic*, chap. 5. gives us with some little difference of Expression. Decretum autem istud extat, apud *Criminum* de hon. discipl. l. 10. c. 3. ex Pontificum libris, in hæc verba, separatim nemo sit habens Deos novos, sive advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto. And *Rigaltius* upon the same Passage of *Tertullian*, tells us, In Fragmentis *Ulpiani* legimus, Deos hæredes institui non posse, præter eos quos Senatus consulto, constitutionibus Principum instituere concessum est. As the ingenious *Mr. Reeves* has observed in his learned Notes upon that *Apologetic*. (b) *Apol. c. 5.*

cuted according to Law, but they suffered in divers respects, not at all by the direction of the Laws, but quite against them, and in violation of the known Rights and Privileges of *Roman Subjects*.

It is noted of *Julian*, that amongst his other Arts to extirpate Christianity, and the ill Turns he did the Christians, one was to deprive them of the benefit of the Laws, the common Right of all Subjects. Wherein it is plain he did not persecute according to Law. He ordered (a) to debarr them from all Assemblies, Markets, Publick Meetings, and the Courts of Judicature; none of which were to be allowed to any, but who would offer Incense as he had appointed. Whereupon Gregory breaks forth into this Exclamation, ὦ νόμοι, καὶ νομοδῖται, καὶ βασιλεῖς, &c. O ye Laws! Legislators, and Kings! who being like the Beauty of Heaven, and the Light of the Sun, and the spreading of the Air, which are of common use, and for the Benefit of all, have accordingly enacted Laws for the good of all Freemen alike, of which yet this Emperor is however contriving to deprive the Christians, to the end that how grievously soever oppressed, they may have no Remedy left them, or if defrauded of any part of their Substance, or any other way injured, whether little or much, they may have no Tribunal to apply to, but like outlawed Persons be forced into Exile, be liable to be Slain, and may hardly be suffered to breathe. This was their hard Fate under that malicious Apostate. Though by God's good Providence, the effect of it, as he informs us, was that they by their Sufferings recommended themselves to God, whilst on the other hand those who inflicted them, acquired to themselves only μείζων τιμὴν κατὰ νόμον καὶ δόξαν, a heavier weight of Guilt, and a sorer Disgrace. Nor can any thing be alledged in vindication of such unreasonable and unjust Proceedings.

Tertullian, well skilled in the *Roman Laws*, affirms of the Empire, that it was (b) *Civilis, non tyrannica Dominatio*; a Civil, not an arbitrary tyrannical Government. So that according to him, whose being in the right there

(a) *Greg. Naz. Orat. 3. adv. Julian, p. 94.* (b) *Apol. c. 2.*

there is no reason to doubt, the Subjects had their Rights and Privileges to insist upon, and all was not left to the despotick Determination and Pleasure of the Emperor. Nor could he make any Encroachment upon these, without doing wrong to his People, and disobeying the Will of his only Superiour, the Lord Most High. So (a) *Tully* notes it as the soundest Foundation of the Roman Liberty, that they had the disposal of their own Rights. Whence it necessarily follows, that whensoever the Christians had these Rights taken from them, without any forfeiture or guilt of their own, and solely by the despotick Will of the Emperor, or his inferiour Rulers and Magistrates, this was as much against Law, as it would be for any to suffer the like here, or in any other Christian Nation. Yet that this was too common with them may easily be shewn in divers particulars of great importance, and which would touch them very nearly. *Tertullian* pleads that though it is a known and a stated Rule in Law, that where the case is the same, the Procedure against the accused ought to be so too, yet the Christians were used differently from all other Criminals. (c) *When accused*, says he, *as guilty, we are treated in another manner, than any else in the like condition.* And *Eusebius* relates (d) That they were used like Enemies with all the rage and fury of War. And none can question it, that shall but a little consider what methods of Treatment they met with from their Governors, such as were peculiar to themselves, and used towards none of their Fellow-subjects. Of which I shall briefly instance in these following Particulars.

1. It was a Privilege of the Roman Citizens, not to be held in Bonds, or Chains. Upon which account it was *S. Paul* made complaint, amongst his other Grievances, of his being (e) made a Prisoner. And when he had acquainted the chief Captain that he was a Roman,

(a) *Orat. 35. pro Cornel. Balbo.*

(c) *Cur à vobis ipsis aliter tractamur, quam patres nostri, id est ceteri nocentes? cum ejusdem noxietatis eadem tractatio deberet intervenire, Apol. c. 2.*

(d) *De vit. Const. l. 1. c. 23.*

(e) *Acts 16: 37.*

man, and Freeborn, we see what followed upon it; (a) Then straightway they departed from him, who should have examined him; and the chief Captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him. Whence it appears how sacred this Right of the Citizens was held at Rome, and in the other Parts of the Empire, and how considerable the Danger of invading it was esteemed. The same is asserted by Tully likewise, who well understood their Laws, and was the most eminent Advocate they ever had. For he declares it (b) a heinous Crime to bind a Roman Citizen. Yet Lactantius assures us, that this did by no means excuse the Christians from this sort of Usage under Maximian, who upon his return home, after his Victory obtained over the Persians, (c) had the Chains ready for such as he could find no pretence to crucify.

2. Another inviolable Privilege was, that no Citizen should be Scourged. For which there is the same Evidence as before, part of S. Paul's Complaint being (d) that they were openly beaten; and Tully branding such a Procedure, (e) as a great Wickedness. And Grotius upon Acts 22. 25. declares it to be against the Porcian and Sempronian Laws. Yet the forenamed Lactantius acquaints us, that this was no Protection to the Christians from Maximian's Fury; (f) but when any was to be beaten, he had four Posts prepared, by means whereof, to add to the indignity of Whipping, they were stretched to such a degree, as no Slave had ever been. And Eusebius affirms (g) that Persons of all Ranks, Degrees, Relations and Ages, were whipt, as well as otherwise punished.

(a) Acts 22. 29.

(b) Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum. c. Verrem. Orat. 10.

(c) Si morte digni viderentur, cruces stabant; sin minus, compedes. De Mort. Persec. c. 21.

(d) Acts 16. 37. (e) Scelus verberari. ubi supra.

(f) Siquis esset verberandus, defixi in stabulo pali quatuor stabant, ad quos nullus unquam servus distendi solebat. Lact. ubi supra.

(g) Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 11.

ed. And *Dioclesian* commanded such as would not sacrifice, (a) to be punished with stripes.

3. Nor were they to be punished *uncondemned*. This, says *Salvian*, (b) is forbidden by the *Laws of the XII Tables*. Yet thus *S. Paul* and *Silas* were used, (c) being beaten openly and cast into Prison, *uncondemned*. And it is but reasonable to suppose that others after them would not escape better. In particular we learn from *Tertullian*, that in his time every thing served for an Accusation against the Christians, and though impossible to be proved upon them, or unreasonable to be suspected of them, was yet enough (d) to incense the Multitude against them. (e) If *Tiber* happened to overflow, or the *Nile* to keep within its Channels; if the Clouds withheld their Rain, or the Earth shook; or if Famine or Pestilence arose, the cry was presently without any more ado, *Christianos ad Leonem*, Away with the Christians, away with them to the Lyon. As also a little before he had complained, (f) That their Judges raged against them, sometimes by the direction of the Laws, and sometimes animis propriis, upon their own private Motions, and to gratify their Animosities, and the unreasonable Aversion they had to them. And as if they were not bad enough, at other times the Rabble, without consulting the Judges, assaulted them with Stones and Fire. Nor would they be prevailed with, so much as to spare their dead Corpses, but (g) after an inhuman manner haled them from the quiet of the Grave, from the sanctuary of Death, when either so rotten or so mangled, as not to be distinguished, cutting them in pieces, and dragging them about the Streets.

4. They were in no case to be crucified, this being a servile Punishment, that none but Slaves could by the Laws of the Empire be made to undergo. So witnesses the

(a) *Last. de mort. pers. c. 10.* See also *Euseb. H. E. l. 8. c. 8. and c. 10.*

(b) *Interfici enim quenquam hominem indemnatum, etiam duodecim Tabularum decreta vetuerunt. De Gubernat. Dei. l. 3.* (c) *Acts 16. 37.*

(d) *Illud solum expectatur, quod odio publico necessarium est. Apol. c. 2.* (e) *C. 40.* (f) *C. 37.* (g) *Ibid.*

the forecited *Tully*, (a) declaring the Crucifixion of any one, who called himself a Citizen of *Rome*, to be a Crime of that prodigious magnitude, that all his Eloquence could not furnish him with a Name ignominious enough for it. Yet whatever exemption others had from this shameful, as well as painful Punishment, the Christians were to hope for none, but must expect to follow their Lord not only in dying for him, as he had done for them, but the same kind of death too. (b) *How slight soever the Cause of their Death was; nay and even in Civil Causes*, to which either no Death was due by the Law, or most certainly not this sort of Death, *they had Crosses erected for them*, which they would be sure to have used upon every occasion.

5. They were never to be condemned unheard. As is plain from *Acts* 25. 16. where *Festus* makes this publick Declaration before King *Agrippa*, *It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to dye, before that he which is accused, have his accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself, concerning the crime laid against him.* And *Grotius* upon *Acts* 16. 37. proves it contrary to the Natural and the Roman Law. To the former, from (c) *Hesiod* and (d) *Seneca*. To the latter, from (e) *Tully*, from (f) *Tacitus*,
from

(a) Quid dicam in crucem tollere? verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest. c. *I'err. ubi supra.* In crucem sic agere ausus es quenuquam, qui se Romanum civem esse diceret? *ibid.*

(b) In causis levibus atq; civilibus, si morte digni viderentur, cruces stabant. *Laſtant. de morte pers. c. 21.*

(c) Μὴ δὲ δίξω δικάσας πρὶν ἀκούειν μὲν δὲ ἀκούσας.

(d) Qui inauditâ parte alterâ aliquid statuerit, Equum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuerit.

(e) De jure Romano testis *Cicero*, *Causâ cognitâ possunt multi absolvi, incognitâ nemo condemnari potest.* The same also he teaches *Orat. 2. pro Sexto Roscio, nocens nisi accusatus fuerit, condemnari non potest.*

(f) Inauditi atq; indefensi, tanquam innocentes perierant. *Histor. l. 1.* Quamvis invisum & nocentem, more tamen audiendum. *l. 3.*

from (a) *Tertullian*, from (b) *Apuleius*, and from (c) *Salvian*. And indeed *Tertullian* not only affirms this Truth; but makes it the foundation of part of his *Apology* in behalf of the Christians. Yet withal he bewails it as a great hardship, (d) That the poor innocent Christians were not permitted to speak for themselves, whereby to manifest the Justice of their Cause, to defend the Truth, or prevent an unjust Sentence from passing upon them; nor was any thing more aimed at in their Tryal for fashion sake, but barely to inflame the Rabble, by a confession of their Name, without any enquiry into their Guilt. Quite contrary to their own usage in other matters. For if a Man was accused of Murder, Sacrilege, Incest, or Treason, they would not pass sentence upon his owning the name of an Offender in any of these kinds, without examining into the nature of the Fact, the place, the manner, the time, and who were privy to it, or actually engaged in it. They could find nothing in the Christians upon the strictest Inquisition, whereon to ground a real Charge against them; and therefore having determined their Destruction beforehand, they thought it necessary to proceed against them only upon the Confession of their being such, against all Reason and Justice, and the Laws of the Empire, and their own Usage in all other cases. And not only so, but *Lactantius* relates, That (e) their Priests and Deacons were seized, and without either their own Confession, or Proof against them, were condemned, and led to execution, together with their Wives
and

(a) *Inauditum si damnant, invidiam iniquitatis merebuntur. In Apolog. Quando non licet indefensos & inauditos omnino damnari. Adv. Nationes.*

(b) *Nec ad instar barbaricæ feritatis, vel tyrannicæ impotentis, damnetur aliquis inauditus. IX Milesiarum.*

(c) *Sed in urbe illa non tam hominum fuerunt hæc beneficia, quàm legum: interfici enim indemnatum quemcunq; hominem, etiam XII Tabularum decreta vetuerunt. Lib. VIII. in fine.*

(d) *Sed Christianis solis nihil permittitur loqui, &c. Apol. c. 2.*

(e) *Comprehensi Presbyteri ac Ministri & sine ulla probatione, aut confessione, damnati, cum omnibus suis deducebantur. De Mort. Persec. c. 15.*

and Children. To the same purpose is that of *Justin Martyr*, (a) Οὐ κρίσεις ἐξετάζετε, &c. Your Judgment is not founded upon a due Examination into the nature of the Charge, but being hurried on by your own unreasonable Passion, and by the instigation of the wicked Demons, (b) ye proceed to sentence, before you are capable of judging, by reason of your not having enquired into the matter before you. Thus careless and unconcerned are you, what becomes of us. And therefore being about to conclude his Apology, he begs for himself and his Fellow-Christians that the Emperors (c) would command a due Enquiry to be made concerning them; and pleads the Emperor *Adrian's* Rescript in their behalf, wherein he orders (d) *Minucius Fundanus* (e) the Proconsul of *Asia*, to give no handle to the Informers for encouraging their Malice against the Christians, and that he should not suffer them to be run down with Noise and Clamour, but if any of his Province had any thing to say against them, it should be done in open Court, and they should have free liberty to answer for themselves. And as on the one hand he would have the Christians duly punished, if they should be convicted of having acted against the Laws; so on the other such as appeared to accuse them out of malice and ill-will, should be sure to suffer severely for it. Which just and reasonable Appointment shews what had been the practice in relation to the Christians, and that they had been too commonly condemned in a tumultuous manner, and without a fair Hearing; because otherwise this Emperor had had no occasion to forbid it, and to enjoin a more regular Process against them. His care to rectify these Proceedings for the future, is too plain a proof that they had been exorbitant and unjustifiable, and so needed a regulation. And indeed to complain of this wicked Usage, seems to have been the great design of *Serenus Granianus* the former Proconsul's Letter to the Emperor. And that it was so *Eusebius* expressly

(a) Apol. 2. p. 55.

(b) Ἀκρίτως κολάζετε, μὴ ἐροῦντες. *ibid.*

(c) Κελεύσαι τὰς κρίσεις γαίῳ. p. 99.

(d) P. 99.

(e) *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 8.*

expresly testifies, the Content of this Letter being, as he relates, (a) *ὡς ἔδίκαιον εἶν ἐπὶ μηδενὶ ἐγκλήματι, βούλῃ δὴμῶ χειρίζεσθαι ἀκρίτως κτείνειν αὐτὰς;* That it was no way consistent with Justice upon whatever Accusation, to be swayed so far by the Voice of the Multitude, as to put them to death without a legal Tryal. This was a notorious abuse of the Courts, and violation of the Subjects Rights, and the protection they ought to have had from the Laws, and yet if it had not been too commonly in practice, we may assure ourselves the Proconsul would never have taken upon him to complain of it to the Emperor, nor would the Emperor have sent his orders for the cure of it.

6. None were to be tortured, but in order to the Confession of what could neither be proved upon them; nor otherwise obtained from them; the legal design of this method of procedure being only, to extort the Truth, when not discoverable by other gentler means. And Tertullian will not allow any good Governor to have used it towards his Subjects, as it was too frequently towards the Christians, but such only as preferred their own arbitrary Will before either Law or Justice. (b) *Tyrants*, says he, *make use of Tortures by way of Punishment; but just Rulers thought themselves bound to use them only for fishing out the Truth.* And upon very good reason. For Laws, as *Franciscus Zephyrus* speaks in his Paraphrase upon these Words, (c) *seem to have invented this way of Procedure, merely in opposition to the obstinate denial of guilty Criminals.* And therefore according to these, a free and open Confession beforehand would inevitably prevent any Sufferings of this nature, there being no room left for Torture, after such an acknowledgment. Which Tertullian therefore justly looked upon as a cruel aggravation

(a) *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 8.*

(b) *Apud tyrannos enim tormenta etiam pro pœnâ adhibentur : apud vos, soli quæstioni temperantur. Apol. c. 2.*

(c) *Leges enim ideo tormenta excogitasse videntur, ut obstinata flagitiosorum negatio expugnaretur. Nam si ultro fateatur, præveniatq; confessio quæstionem, nihil eâ opus est, sed vacat. In loc.*

tion of their inhumanity and abuse of the Christians; that such a Confession from these did not put a stop to the Rack, as it would with all the World besides, but on the contrary against all Pretence either of Law or Equity, brought it upon them. And accordingly he objects it as a shameful instance of Irregularity and Misgovernment, as undoubtedly it was, (a) *That they were compelled by Torture to recede from their Confession, after they had made it, and were therefore to have been discharged, since they had done nothing whereby to deserve, that they should be proceeded against as Criminals;* and that (b) *those who presided in this affair, and were appointed to search out the Truth, applied their Power on the contrary with respect to the Christians, and to none but them, to extort a Lye from them; and (c) to this end racked them, not only after their Confession, but because of it.* And at another time he urges it as what they could not pretend to deny, That (d) *their manner in relation to other Malefactors, when brought upon Tryal, and pleading not guilty, was to try if by the help of the Rack they could bring them to own their Guilt; but when Christians confessed freely of themselves, they must look to be racked upon a quite opposite account, namely to compel them to retract their Confession.* Thus perversely were they treated, whilst their Tormentors, after an unaccountable manner, set themselves to stifle what they so publickly acknowledged, altering the design of their Tortures, dismissing the truly guilty with impunity, and forcing others into the like guilt against their Wills; using a cross sort of Enquiry, as *Minucius Felix*, (e) an Advocate in the Courts, well acquainted with the Laws, and of no small Character in his Profession, expresses it, (f) *not to draw forth the Truth, but to force out a Lye.* This was

G

so

(a) *Cogitis tormentis de confessione decedere, ibid.*

(b) *Veritatis extorquendæ præsidēs de nobis solis mendacium elaboratis audire. ibid.* (c) *Torquemur confitentes. ib.*

(d) *Ad Nationes. l. 1. c. 2.*

(e) *Minutius Felix non ignobilis inter Causidicos loci fuit. Lact. Instit. l. 5. c. 1.*

(f) *Exercentes perversam quæstionem, non quæ verum erueret, sed quæ mendacium cogeret. Octav. p. 257, 258.*

so palpably, so scandalously partial in the Governors, and so heavy a burden upon the Christians, that *Tertullian* repeats his charge of it over and over. He tells the Judges, (a) *This was such a perverseness, as that they ought to suspect themselves under some strong byass, that could incline them to act in such direct contradiction to their usual Forms in other cases, to the nature and design of their Office, and to the very Words of the Law.* And again, (b) *You give very different Instructions to your Executioner with respect to us Christians, not that they compel us to declare what we act, but to make us deny what we are.* So likewise says *S. Cyprian*, (c) *The use of Torture is for the Guilty, who disclaim the Guilt they are charged with, that by this means the truth of the Crime which the Mouth will not own, may be pressed out by the pain of the Body.* But lo here quite otherwise, though I readily confess, and proclaim it, and again and again and as expressly as may be, testify myself to be a Christian, yet for what good reason I know not, you torture me upon my Confession, which ought to have been done only upon my Denial. And that this was no vain plea, but a true state of the case, the Words of the Law are very clear, enacting Torture to be used solely for finding out the Truth. (d) *In criminibus eruendis questio adhiberi solet.* This sort of Inquisition is wont to be used for forcing out the Truth. And again, (e) *Si aliter veritas inveniri non possit, licet habere questionem.* They may be thus examined when the Truth cannot be come at otherwise. This therefore is the sole End for which the Law appointed Torture. And nothing could be a fouler abuse of the Law, and more diametrically opposite to the true design of Torture, than to apply it thus to a directly contrary purpose. Yet this was an usual method of plaguing

(a) *Suspecta sit vobis ista perversitas, &c. Apol. c. 2.*

(b) *Longe aliud munus carnifici in Christianos imperatis, non ut dicant, quæ faciunt, sed ut negent quod sint. c. 7.*

(c) *Torquentur rei qui se negant crimine quo accusantur teneri, ut facinoris veritas, quæ indice voce non promitur, dolore corporis exprimatur. Nunc vero cum sponte confiteor, &c. Ad Demetr.*

(d) *Digest. l. 48. Tit. 18. c. 1.*

(e) *C. 7.*

plaguing the poor Christians, who could not have common Humanity shewn them, so long as they refused to renounce their most holy Profession.

And yet I have hitherto taken no notice of another Hardship put upon them in this respect; which was, That (a) Children were called upon to accuse their Parents, and the most faithful Servants, and the Wives were put to the Torture, to make them witness against their Masters, and Husbands. Which being against the Laws of Nature and Nations, as well as against the Roman, is a very remarkable Evidence of the Christians being persecuted against Law.

7. Those of Condition amongst the Romans were never to be tortured at all; as (b) *Gisbertus Cuperus* observes. And it is not therefore without reason, (c) that *Lactantius* represents it as a gross illegal Innovation, in *Maximin*, that he inflicted this sort of punishment upon the chief Magistrates, and the highest and principal Persons in any City. And in such an unwonted Invasion of their known Liberties, it is not to be imagined the Christians should escape a large share of it. In truth a particular care was taken that they should not; it being expressly ordered, That those of that Religion should be subjected to it, (d) of whatsoever Rank or Quality they were.

8. Whereas by the Law they were to be allowed Council to plead for them upon their Tryal, this Privilege was likewise denied them. (e) They were not permitted the same liberty for clearing themselves, that others had freely granted them. When the Heathens were accused of the same Crimes, they had not only leave to speak for themselves, but might have Council also to set off their Case to the better advantage; nor were they to be condemned without a full Hearing. (f) But it was far otherwise with

G 2

the

(a) Filii adversus parentes suspendebantur, fidelissimi quique servi contra Dominos vexabantur, uxores adversus maritos. *Lact. de mort. pers. c. 23.*

(b) In *Lact. de mort. pers. c. 13.* (c) *C. 21.*

(d) Ex quocunque ordine & gradu venirent. *I. l. c. 12.*

(e) *Tertull. Apol. c. 2.* (f) *De nobis nihil tale, &c. ib.*

the Christians, who might not offer what was necessary for their own Defence; though Justice would require their Charge to be thoroughly sifted no less than others. (a) The Eloquence of the Bar was sometimes silenced, the Advocates were destroyed, (b) and the Lawyers that should have assisted them were either sent into Banishment, or out of the World. So that they had none to assist them in their Extremity, to urge the Law in their behalf, and either bring them off where there was room for it, or shew how unjustly they were handled, when sentenced against Law.

9. And to render the Case still more hard and dangerous, they had Judges who understood little or nothing of the Laws, but had been bred up and employed in as different a Profession as might be. (c) Military Men, void of all Learning, were not only sent to try Causes in the Provinces, but without any Assessors to advise them, as had been usual in other like cases; and as was more especially necessary in this, when the Judges were so scandalously unqualified for a due execution of the weighty Office they had taken upon them.

10. At other times it was ordered that the Christians should have no benefit of the Law, (d) but their Judges might deal with them as inhumanly as they pleased. And (e) that none but Heathens might be admitted to any legal Remedy upon whatever occasion, Altars were placed in their Courts of Judicature, and all were required to offer upon them, before their Cause was allowed to be heard. And as they might not plead without this heathenish compliance, so
also

(a) *Eloquentia extincta, causidici sublati, jureconsulti aut relegati, aut necati. Laët. de mort. pers. c. 22.*

(b) *Rectè hos distinguit, quia illi [causidici] causas in foro vel judiciis agebant; hi vero [jureconsulti] de jure respondebant. Giss. Cuper. in loc.*

(c) *Judices militares humanitatis, literarum rudes, sine assessoribus in provincias missi. Laëtant. ibid.*

(d) *Licentia rerum omnium, solutis legibus, adsumpta & judicibus data. ibid.*

(e) *Ne cui temerè jus diceretur, aræ in secretariis ac pro tribunali positæ, ut litigatores prius sacrificarent, atq; ita causas suas dicerent. id. c. 15.*

also on the other hand, (a) any Action might be brought against them, whilst their Hands were thus illegally tied up, and they could have none brought against such as had wronged them in any sort, could neither sue for reparation upon Adulteries committed against them, or for their Goods taken away by Stealth or Robbery; but must be contented to sit down with the loss, without hope of Redress, and perhaps be insulted over for such their Disability. So that, as Eusebius writes, (b) they became a sort of Outlaws, and in the condition of besieged Soldiers, utterly unable to help themselves.

II. They were stript of all their Honours and Dignities. So says (c) Eusebius, If any of our Religion were in an honourable Station, he was to become ἀπῆμος, ignoble, without any Honour or Regard to be paid him for the future. This Lactantius also testifies, (d) as to those who had Preferments or Honours to lose. And as to those of meaner condition, we have his Evidence likewise, that Slaves were not to be manumitted, without having first renounced their Christianity, to qualify them for it. (e) Libertatem deniq; ac vocem non haberent; They were to have no Freedom, or power of Voting. Which Words are thus explained by Eusebius, (f) As for Servants, if they retained their Profession of Christianity, they were not to be made Free. So that, as Baluzius observes, (g) here were illegal Punishments appointed for all sorts and orders amongst them. Those in higher station were to be degraded, the generality or middle sort were (as I noted just before) deprived of the benefit of the Laws, and the lowest of them, the Servants and Slaves were to continue in that rank, without hope of that Freedom which by Law they would have a just claim

G 3

to;

(a) Propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut --- adversus eos omnis actio caleret, ipsi non de injuriâ, &c. *Id. c. 13.*

(b) Οὐδέπ᾽ αὐτῷ κοινῷ νόμῳ, πλείους δὲ τρέπω πεπολιοικημένον. *Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 10.*

(c) *Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 2.*

(d) Ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate. *Lact. de mort. pers. c. 13.* In primis honores ademit. *c. 21.* (e) *Ibid.* (f) *Ubi supra.* (g) *In Lact. c. 13.*

to; than which nothing could be more manifestly against Law.

12. Or if these Words of *Lactantius* may be understood in a larger sense, as for ought I know they may, so as not to be restrained to Servants only, but to relate to the whole Body of Christians, the abuse will be so much the grosser and more inexcusable. *The Right of Suffrage* Sigonius affirms (a) to be a matter of great moment, not only to the Romans, but any Citizens whatsoever. And to have not only this, but other their known Liberties arbitrarily ravished from them, and so be unjustly deprived of an essential part of their Birthright, would be an Invasion they would have sufficient reason to complain of as illegal. And thus much is plain from a passage of this same *Lactantius*, declaring of *Maximian*, That he (b) made it his business to get Men deprived of their Liberty, when he was afraid openly to avow it, because against all pretence of Law.

13. They were sometimes allowed a Tryal, but proceeded against upon false and groundless Accusations, contrived on purpose for their undeserved Destruction. Not only *Nero* did this in setting *Rome* on fire, (c) and then casting the blame of it upon the poor, harmless, innocent Christians, and thereupon ordering them to be wrapt in Beasts skins, and to have the Dogs set upon them in this dress, to tear them to pieces, or else to be crucified, or (d) to be burnt, being so daubed beforehand, as that they might serve for a new sort of Flambeaux in the night-time: But the same Prank was plaid again by the most inhuman *Galerius* privately, (e) who by the ministry of some hidden Agents, had his Palace at *Nicomedia* set on fire, and then had the Christians charged

(a) De antiq. jur. Civ. Rom. l. 1. c. 17.

(b) Quia id aperte jubere non poterat, sic agebat ut & ipse libertatem hominibus auferret. De mort. pers. c. 21.

(c) Tacit. Annal. l. 15. & Sulpic. Sever. hist. sacr. l. 2. c. 41.

(d) Ibid.

(e) Occultis ministris palatio subjecit incendium. Et cum pars quædam conflagrasset, Christiani arguebantur velut hostes publici. Lact. de m. pers. c. 14.

charged with it, and plentifully put to death for it; as (a) *Eusebius* acquaints us. And as if all the fore-named Barbarities were not barbarous enough,

14. *Lastly*, They were put to unusual Deaths, and such as no Law directed. *Lactantius* asks, (b) *What number of Volumes can be expected to contain such infinite and different kinds of Cruelty, as they were made to undergo?* And again a little after, (c) he declares it impossible to tell how many and how grievous sorts of Torments, their Judges had been able to invent for the carrying on their Design of extirpating Christianity. And at another time, (d) *Non mihi si linguae centum sint, ora; centum, &c.* Had I a hundred Mouths, as many Tongues, and a most lasting Voice, it would yet be above my power to recount all the wicked Inventions, and the several names of all the Punishments, which the Judges through the Provinces have found out for tormenting the righteous and innocent Disciples of our Lord. All the merciless sanguinary Laws enacted against them, did not satisfy the Rage of their persecuting Princes; but they contrived other ways of their own to get rid of them. Thus *Sozomen* relates a private order of *Valens*, (e) for the destruction of about eighty Ecclesiastical Persons, for only coming to petition his Favour, and the mitigation of those Severities his Magistrates had executed upon them; that they should be secretly put on board a Ship, and made away with. By means whereof, under pretence of Banishment, they were carried off to Sea, and there (f) the Vessel was purposely set on fire, and so they were all either burnt, or drowned. As *Galerius Maximinus* in like manner, had before served a

G 4

great

(a) Οὐκ εἶδ' ὅπως ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Νικομήδειαν βασιλείᾳ, περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀφ' ἧς ἐκείνη, ὡς καὶ ὁ πόντος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἐπιχειρηθῆναι λόγος διαδοθέν, παρ' ἐνὶ σαρδόν βασιλικῇ νόμῳ τῇ τῇδε δευσεβῶν, οἱ μὲν, εἴρει κατεγράποντο· οἱ δὲ διὰ πρὸς ἐτελείοντο. Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 6.

(b) Instit. l. 5. c. 11.

(c) Ibid.

(d) De mort. pers. c. 16.

(e) Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.

(f) Οἱ μὲν ναῦται περὶ τὸ σκάφος ὑπάφαντες, ὡς αὐτοῖς περὶ σταγυρῶν, ὑπάρχον εἰς τὸ ἐξόλκον μεταπερὶ ἴσαντες. Ἡ δὲ ναὺς διελύθη συν αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσι κατεφλεγέσθαι. ibid.

great company of poor People, at a time when by his excessive Exactions he had reduced the Empire to extraordinary Want and Distress; whom because they were not in circumstances to answer his unreasonable Demands, (a) he commanded to be shipped off and drowned. Neither were the other tenderer Sex any more secure than the Men. For Gregory Nazianzen from amongst others singles out a dreadful Story of Julian's inhumanity towards them, (b) *ἐρίκνυς κὺ τοῖς ἀδείοις ἀξίον*, a Story which might well strike the most hardened Atheists at the mention of it; nor could any thing possibly be said in mitigation of such unparalleled Barbarity; When chaste and holy Virgins, who had had their Conversation continually in Heaven, and rarely appeared amongst Men, were publicly stript, and being first exposed naked, had their Bodies at length mangled and dissected, and their Flesh eaten by those more than brutish Tormentors. Nor did their Fury stop here; but farther to glut their execrable Malice, (c) They cast Swines Food into their reeking Entrails, and then letting in the Swine upon them, regaled themselves with the sight of those voracious Animals preying upon them, tearing and devouring them, after a manner never before seen or heard of, in the execution of the most incorrigible and outrageous Malefactor. Another (d) had his Flesh torn from off the Bones, and then was washed with Salt and Vinegar, and broiled on a Gridiron. (e) Others had their Flesh pared off, their Limbs disjointed, their Bodies torn with Whips, after all which, and infinite other Tortures, they were cast into the Fire. (f) Some were drowned in the Sea, some were starved to Death, some died upon the Gibbet, and some in a most woful manner had their Feet nailed to the Tree, and so hung till they died of Hunger. (g) Others were hanged up by the

(a) Congregari omnes jussit, & exportatos naviculis in mare mergi. Lact. de m. pers. c. 23.

(b) Orat. 3. adv. Julian. p. 87.

(c) *Ἐπαίρεσαν ἂν τοῖς ἀλάγχχοις συνώδην τετραχὺ ἐπαπαίραντες, καὶ συνὼν ἐπαδόντες τὰς δεξιότερας, οἷον ἀγαγεῖν ἐκείνο τὸ δέμας, σάβρας ἰδεῖν κριδαῖς συνεαδικωδίας, &c.* ibid.

(d) Euseb. l. 8. c. 6. (e) C. 8. (f) Ibid. & Lact. c. 15. & c. 37. (g) Euseb. l. 8. c. 19

the Hands tied behind them, their Limbs being artfully distended, and their whole Body grievously tormented, beyond what was wont to be done to Murderers. (a) Some were fastened up by one Hand only, and so hung in most excessive Pain. (b) Some were pricked under their Nails; some had melted Lead poured down their Backs, and others were tormented in a manner not fit to be named. In a word, (c) such was the Fierceness and Inhumanity of their Persecutors, and so ingenious their Cruelty, that they employed themselves to invent new Punishments, and seem never to have been better pleased, than when they could contrive to surpass all that had gone before in Severity and Torture.

Whose Heart is not ready to bleed at the relation of such Tragical Usage, of not only the innocent, but the pious and holy Servants of God, who in all respects had deserved a far better Treatment? Yet multitudes of Instances might be produced, of Christians thus dying illegal and unwonted Deaths, and which proceeded purely from the arbitrary Will and Pleasure of their Persecutors. But I forbear; and shall rather conclude with this Reflection in answer to Mr. H. If ever any Princes in the World forfeited their Authority, by *deflecting from the Will of God, and the End of their Institution*, sure the Authors of these intolerable, and the more so because every way undeserved, Cruelties, must have done it. Yet did not these abused Christians look upon it, as consistent with their Duty to fly to Arms, in order to their Deliverance from the power of such blood-thirsty Tyrants, even when their Hands lay heaviest upon them. Nor can Mr. H. produce so much as one instance of this nature, amongst these meek and passive Followers of the Blessed JESUS.

No Times, as the excellent Mr. Kettlewell has rightly observed, (d) *ever afforded better Pleas for Resistance than those under these forementioned Persecutions.* Yet were none

(a) Ibid.

(b) C. 12.

(c) B. Cypr. a Demetrian. p. 190.

(d) Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross. ch. 4. p. 53.

none ever more eminent for *Passive-Obedience*, or *Faith and Patience*, without taking Arms against their Governors, to defend themselves. It is likewise Bishop Bilson's observation, and Mr. H. cannot disprove it, (a) That for the first 600 Years there cannot be shewn any one Example, where an Heretical Prince was deposed, or a Subject allowed to bear Arms against his Sovereign. A sufficient Conviction that Pagans and Hereticks were all this while honoured, obeyed, and endured by the Church of Christ, if they were Princes. And Dr. Hakewil notes farther in justification of those first and purer Times of our Religion, as to the Duty of Subjects to their Princes, (b) That none then who bare the name of Christian, how heterodox soever in his other opinion, yet ever thought he might take upon him forcibly to resist his Superiours; and particularly as to the prevailing Sect at that time, that though S. Jerome (c) bewailed the sad change that was wrought in the World, and that it was astonished to see itself all of a sudden so generally become Arian; yet did he never charge any Arian, as bad as they were in other respects, with Rebellion against the State; this being what no sort of Christian had yet learned. Nor is this any more than what we find moreover in that learned Lawyer Franciscus Balduinus, who treating of Minucius Felix's elegant Discourse, in defence of the Christian Religion, has this observation; (d) *Cum calumniator ingeniosus, &c.* Whereas this acute Calumniator [meaning Cæcilius] did not stick at either forging, or enlarging, whatever might serve to expose the Christians, he had nevertheless taken no occasion to accuse them of Disloyalty and Rebellion. Though, as he proceeds, some before had objected it, and it seemed a very proper Engine for hastening their Destruction. Of which undeserved Charge the learned Bishop Parker gives this account, which fully justifies them from it; namely, That (e) though they were usually indicted of Treason by their Enemies,

(a) Of Christian Subjection, &c. Part. 3. p. 401, 402.

(b) Scut. Reg. l. 3. c. 1. (c) Adv. Lucifer. c. 7.

(d) Prolegom. in M. Fel. Octav.

(e) Religion and Loyalty. Part. 1. p. 158.

Enemies, yet the only Proof of it was their refusing to sacrifice, or swear by the Emperor's Genius. And setting this aside, there was not any one Charge upon Record, of any one Act of Disloyalty; and that (as says the forenamed learned Lawyer) was the Glory of their Ancestors, that they would be provoked by no Injuries to any thought of Hostility, against lawful Sovereigns, howsoever barbarously they were treated by them, or enter into any Conspiracies against them, though at that time they were frequent and plausible; as being always mindful, what became their Patience, Meekness, Modesty, and Sobriety. So far were they from being Turbulent and Seditious, and running mad with a thirst of Revenge. This Character too is given of them by Heathens as well as Christians, and therefore is so much the less liable to suspicion. I shall instance but in two of them, but those such as could not be themselves deceived, nor had any temptation to deceive others in favour of the Christians, especially the latter, who after his departure from them, became their subtle and implacable Enemy.

The one is the younger *Pliny*, the Proconsul of *Bithynia* under *Trajan*; and he gives this Character of those under his Jurisdiction, (a) That he could find no other fault in them, but a *Stubbornness* and inflexible *Obstinacy*, that is to say, in resolving not to sacrifice to the *Roman* Deities; adding farther for their Honour, that though he had tortured two of the weaker Sex who had come off from them, he could learn nothing more from these, than that they were wont on a certain day, which I take to mean every Lord's day, to assemble before it was light, to repeat a Hymn to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by a solemn Oath, not to commit any sort of Wickedness, any Thefts, Robberies, or Adulteries; not to break their Word, or deny what was deposited with them. Where it is remarkable that upon his strictest Inquisition, he could find no pretence to charge them, with any Principles of Sedition or Treason, or any Resistance of the Emperor, or of Himself his Vicegerent. The

(a) *Lib. 10. Epist. 97. & Tertull. Apol. c. 2. & Niceph. l. 3. c. 7.*

The other I designed to appeal to is the wicked Apostate *Julian*, who considering his former manner of Life, could not possibly be ignorant of either the Doctrines or Practices of the Christians; yet he bears them this Testimony, not out of good-will we may depend upon it, but only because it was too plain to be denied, That they encouraged no Insurrections or Rebelions, no *Resistance in some cases*, but on the other hand were sure presently to punish any that they found offending in this respect. (a) *Εἰ πρὸς εἰς τὴ βασιλέα ἐπίδωκεν ἀπικρίβευτος, αὐτίκα μάλ᾽ ἀκολάζει.* They no sooner discover a Subject behaving himself undutifully towards his Prince, but they immediately take him to task for it. A noble Evidence in their favour, considering from whom it comes! And which upon that account may perhaps be thought preferable to many of those we have from such as were of their own side.

Thus I have shewn in divers particulars, what illegal Usage the ancient Christians met with from time to time, from their cruel Persecutors. And I have insisted the longer upon it, as to convince Mr. *H.* that these eminent Professors of our Faith, durst not resist such Governors as were certainly Enemies to the Good of the Society, so likewise to let some others see that they were thus patient and submissive, when not only Persecuted for the sake of their Religion, but moreover when Persecuted against Law.

And now if Mr. *H.* or any else, should object that some few of the divers Illegalities here enumerated, concerned not the Christians barely as such, but others of their fellow Subjects were sharers in their Burdens, and bare a part with them; This I readily grant. But withal I see not what service this can possibly do the Cause of Resistance; for it makes plainly against it, by shewing that the Christians might not have had their own strength only to rely upon in such a case, but might in all probability have had the assistance of such the Companions of their Sufferings, if they would have taken

(a) *Jul. Imp. Fragm. Epist. Opp. p. 528.*

taken upon them to begin a Rebellion, in order to the redress of these intolerable Grievances. If they had Power and Numbers sufficient, or as *S. Cyprian* speaks (a) *more than enough*, to defend themselves without them, as I shall presently prove they had, much more might they have hoped to do it with them. Yet neither the Miseries they endured, nor their own Strength, nor the expectation of Help from these Auxiliaries, could tempt them to such an unchristian Undertaking. On the contrary,

IV. They bare their many Hardships with a wonderful Calmness and Submission, not suffering themselves to be wearied out of their Temper, or their Duty, by all the terrible Encounters they so frequently met with. They had so great an abhorrence of the Imputation, much more of the Conscience, of having acted contrary to the Principles of their Religion, though when perfectly besides their own Intention and Thoughts, and when merely tricked into it, and without any apprehension of what they were doing, that they would choose rather to undergo any kind of Punishment, how grievous soever. As was visible (b) in *Julian's* Soldiers, who having been unwittingly betrayed into the Worship of the Heathen Gods, under the notion of doing Homage to the Emperor, were no sooner convinced of their Error, but immediately they ran forth like Men besides themselves, professing themselves Christians, and utterly disclaiming what they had done, as a treacherous Imposition upon them, and which had they been aware of, they would have lost their Lives over and over, before they would have been brought to it, and begging Death as a just Reward of their Folly. And others who were attacked in a different manner, readily yielded to bear all that should be laid upon them, with Resignation and Patience, and a due regard, neither to part with their Religion nor their Loyalty, even to the

(a) *Ad Demetrian.*

(b) *Greg. Naz. Orat. 3. adv. Julian, p. 83, 84, 85. & Sozom. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 17.*

the (a) tiring of their hard-hearted Executioners. And which is the more remarkable, no Sex, or Age, State or Condition, but had their portion of these Tryals. And yet neither a concern for themselves, nor for their Wives and Children, could carry them beyond the Bounds prescribed by their Religion. (b) *Husbands and Wives, young Men and Maids, old Men and Women, Soldiers and private Persons, every Degree and Age, were Whipt, and Burnt, and slain with the Sword, and overcoming these Conflicts, τὰς σεβάνας ἀπειλήσας, received their Crowns of Martyrdom.* Which they could never have hoped to attain to by Resistance. (c) *Military Men suffered themselves to be disbanded, (d) Wives were taken from their Husbands for the Emperor's Lust, and (e) Daughters from their Parents. (f) The Prisons that were designed for Murderers and Robbers of the Dead, were stuffed with Bishops, Priests and Deacons, together with others of inferior Orders, till there was no room left for Malefactors. (g) Their Barns were shut up, their Granaries were secured, their Flocks and their Herds were wrested from them. Their (h) Scriptures were burnt. (i) Their Churches were demolished. (k) They had their Eyes put out, and their Hands and Feet cut off, and their Noses and Ears.* Such Pains, such Indignities, such Outrages of all sorts did they endure; which one would think, if any thing, would have tempted them to conspire together for their own and the Empire's Deliverance from such tyrannical and unmerciful Usage.

And

(a) *Inter fatigatos carnifices. Lactant. Instit. l. 5. c. 13. Steterunt torti torquentibus fortiores; & pulsantes ac laniantes ungulas pulsata ac laniata membra vicerunt. B. Cypr. Epist. 10.*

(b) *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 11. Omnis sexus & ætatis homines ad exustionem rapti. Lact. de mort. pers. c. 15.*

(c) *Tertull. Apol. c. 2. Lactant. de mort. pers. c. 10. Euseb. l. 8. c. 4.*

(d) *Lact. C. 21.*

(e) *Id. c. 8. & c. 38.*

(f) *Euseb. H. E. l. 8. c. 6.*

(g) *Lactant. de m. c. 38.*

(h) *Id. c. 12. & Euseb. H. E. l. 8. c. 31.*

(i) *Lact. & Euseb. ibid.*

(k) *Lact. c. 36.*

And to add to the Terror of these Proceedings, multitudes of them suffered together, so many that one would have hoped their very Numbers might have created pity and compassion towards them. And they must necessarily have done it in others, as well as *Pliny* and *Trajan*, had not their Persecutors Hearts been like Adamants, or the nether *Milstone*. (a) *Sozomen* speaks of a vast number destroyed at once by *Sapores* in *Persia*; reckoning the Names of such as were known to amount to no less than 16000 Men and Women; but adding withal, that (b) the rest who suffered were innumerable. At other times such Crowds of them were made to undergo infinite Tortures, that according to (c) *Eusebius* it was impossible to recite their Sufferings. And if *Nicephorus* may be credited, (d) no fewer than Twenty Thousand were burnt together at *Nicomedia*, being assembled for the solemn Commemoration of our Lord's Nativity. Thus also speaks *S. Cyprian* of the Martyrs in his days. (e) Now the Christian Martyrs are beyond numbring, according to that of the (f) *Apocalypse*, *After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands.* To the same purpose we have likewise the Testimony of *Gregory the Great*, (g) *Look Brethren, and see how the whole World is filled with Martyrs, so that we who can see it, are hardly so many, as we have known suffer for the Truth. God can count them up, but to us they seem to be multiplied beyond the Sand, and past computation, and not to be comprehended by us.* So says *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (h) *We have abundant Fountains of Martyrs every day, that are seen before our Eyes, of such as are Roasted, and Crucified, and Beheaded.* And *Eusebius* in several places relates, that in

Seve-

(a) Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 14.

(b) Τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῶν πλείων καὶ ἐπὶ ἀριθμῶν. ibid.

(c) Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 6.

(d) Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 6.

(e) De exhort. Mart. c. 11.

(f) C. 7. 9.

(g) In Evang. hom. 27.

(h) Strom. l. 2. p. 480.

Severus's Persecution, (r) there were famous and celebrated Martyrdoms, but Alexandria had incomparably the greatest plenty of them, and (a) that an almost infinite number were adorned with the Crown of Martyrdom. And again under Dioclesian, he professes That (b) no Oratory or Eloquence can duly describe the vast Numbers and undaunted Courage of the Martyrs of Christ, that suffered both in the Cities and in the Countries. And Lactantius challenges any one to tell him what Beast could compare for brutishness and fierceness, with the Judges and other Officers into whose Hands the Christians fell. What Caucasus, says he, (c) what India, what Hyrcania ever bred such savage and blood-thirsty Beasts? The Fury of all wild Beasts terminates in the filling of their Bellies, and their Hunger being once satisfied is presently allayed. But that is the true Beast, by whose bare command black Blood is every where poured forth, and which every where causes Mourning, Trembling, and Death in divers shapes. None can describe the Rage of such a Beast in its proper colours; which lies in one place, but tears with its iron Teeth in all places; and not only pulls Mens Limbs from each other, but breaks their very Bones, and reduces them to Ashes, that so they may have no place of Burial allowed them. I presume Mr. H. will not reckon such Monsters of Cruelty, Violence, and barbarous Inhumanity, by whose Command these horrid Abuses were acted, amongst those few good Governors, to whom alone he teaches Submission and Obedience to be due. Yet as excessively outrageous as they shewed themselves to be, these holy Servants of God looked upon them as his Ordinance, and quietly and contentedly submitted to them as such.

But above all, the famed instance of the *Thebean Legion* suffering at *Agannum*, now *S. Maurice*, in *Savoy*, if the truth of the (d) relation may be depended upon, is a most gloriously memorable Testimony to both Religion and Loyalty at the same time. For what could possibly

(r) H. E. l. 6. c. 1. (a) C. 2. (b) L. 8. c. 4.

(c) Instit. l. 5. c. 11.

(d) Ab Euch. Lugdun. script. apud Surium, ad diem 22 Septembris.

possibly be a more demonstrative Evidence of an invincible Zeal for both, than that a whole Legion, consisting almost of seven Thousand valiant and well appointed Soldiers should yield themselves, to be butchered one after another, without striking a Stroke in their own Defence, rather than incur either the Guilt of Idolatry against God, or of Resistance against their Prince? Or what good Christian would not heartily admire the Courage and Constancy, and herewith the Fidelity and Loyalty of *Mauritius* the General, encouraging the rest after the first Decimation, in these Words,—" I congratulate your Valour and your Constancy, most worthy
 " Fellow-Soldiers, that the Commands of *Cæsar* have
 " not been more prevalent with you, than the Love of
 " your Religion. You have beheld your Brethren joy-
 " fully undergoing a glorious Death. But with what
 " fear was I struck hereupon, lest being armed as ye
 " are, any one amongst you should, under the notion
 " of Defence, have sought to prevent these most happy
 " Funerals ! I had before my Eyes, as an effectual An-
 " tidote against any such unwarrantable attempt, the
 " Example of our Blessed Lord, commanding his A-
 " postle *S. Peter*, to put up his Sword into its sheath, here-
 " by teaching a Christian Reliance upon God, to be
 " preferable to all the help of our Weapons; with more
 " to the same purpose : Or the correspondent Meekness
 and good Disposition of the Soldiers in returning this
 answer to *Maximian*, " We are your Soldiers, O *Cæsar*,
 " who have listed ourselves for the Defence of the Em-
 " pire, and never deserted our Station, nor betrayed
 " our Trust, nor incurred the Charge of Negligence, or
 " Cowardise. Nor would we ever scruple to obey
 " your Commands, did they not interfere with the
 " Laws of our Religion, which have condemned the Wor-
 " ship of Devils, and your polluted Altars. We are
 " surprized to find an Order from you, that the
 " Christians must either defile themselves with your
 " sacrilegious Offerings, or be terrified with a Deci-
 " mation. However, to prevent your taking upon
 " yourself the trouble of enquiring, who amongst us
 H " are

“ are Christians, we here assure you we are all such;
 “ and all our Bodies are at your disposal, but our Souls
 “ are Christ’s, and out of your power: Or that of
Exuperius the Ensign, “ Despair, which is most pres-
 “ sing in dangers, has not armed us against thee, O
 “ Emperor, for though we have our Arms in readiness,
 “ we will not Resist thee, for we had much rather be
 “ slain than overcome, esteeming it far better to dye
 “ innocent, than live with guilt upon us.” Such a
 fear of God are they said to have had upon their Minds,
 and in a full persuasion of the Truth of his Promises,
were put to the Sword one after another, without Resisting.
 A plainer, fuller Instance of the *Faith and Patience* of
 these *Saints* could not be desired, provided the account
 we have of them be true. As it has been thought to be
 by very great Men, and as good Judges of a matter of this
 nature, as any in their time; such as (a) *Grotius* abroad,
 and at home Archbishop (b) *Usher*, Bishop (c.) *Ward*,
 Bishop (c) *Stillingfleet*, Dr. (d) *Cave*, Dr. (e) *Hickes*, Dr.
 (f) *Falkener*, &c. Yet because Mr. *Dubourdien’s Historical*
Dissertation, wherein he endeavours to prove it fabulous,
 has never yet been answered that I know of, and I have
 not time to examine it at present, I shall therefore make
 no other use of it, than to infer that supposing it a For-
 gery, before the time of *Encherius Lugdunensis*, from
 whom we first had it, it is highly reasonable to believe
 that whosoever forged it, would be sure to accommodate
 his Forgery, as much as might be, to the Notions and
 Practices of the Times wherein he did it, and not set
 abroad so improbable a Story, as every one at the first
 hearing must needs know, to have nothing of Truth, or
 so much as Verisimilitude in it. Nor is it to be ima-
 gined, that one of *Encherius’s* Character and Station;
 would

(a) *De jur. B. ac P. l. 1. c. 4.*

(b) *Of the Power of the Prince, &c. p. 219.*

(c.) *Serm. 1. p. 33.* (c) *Antiq. of the Brit. Churches. ch. 2.*

(d) *Prim. Christianity. Part. 3. ch. 4. & Hist. liter. in Eu-
 cherii Opp.*

(e) *Serm. before the Lord Mayor, Jan. 30. 1681-2.*

(f) *Christian Loyalty. B. 2. ch. 4. sect. 3.*

would have undertaken to transmit the Memory of this illustrious Occurrence to Posterity, if the Contrivance of it, as well as the Evidence for it, had not carried with it an air of Truth.

But there is less pretence of Exception to that of *Palladius*, concerning the State of the Christians under *Arcadius*, and the Reason given of their Sufferings, That (a) when the Emperor observing a great number of them together, almost three Thousand, of new baptized Converts, and being told by some of their back-friends, that they were Hereticks, a Party were sent to apprehend their Teachers, and disperse the rest, and some of both sorts were actually seized, and hereupon Enquiry came to be made, how it could be that 3000 of them should tamely suffer their Assembly to be secured by a few Soldiers? The Return made to this Enquiry was, *That this neither shewed want of Strength, nor of Zeal to save themselves, but proceeded purely from the Influence their Religion had upon them, and the Industry of their Teachers incessantly instilling into them Principles of Peace.* Nor was it reasonable, says *Theodorus*, one of the Dialogists in that Life, *that those whom S. Chrysostom had taught Prudence and Meekness, should defend themselves in a foolish tumultuous manner.* Their Principles were against all Resistance of the Higher Powers, though cruel persecuting Powers, such as the Apostles lived and wrote under, and their Behaviour was very agreeable hereto. Insomuch that they would choose to endure the worst of Treatments, rather than attempt to preserve themselves, by such means as they well knew to be inconsistent with the Precepts of Christianity. Thus did the Christians of those Times glorify God by a patient Submission to whatever Evils it pleased his Divine Wisdom to bring upon them, by means of their unkind and merciless Sovereigns, without quarreling at the Instruments he made use of, for bringing these Evils upon them.

H 2

V. And

(a) De vit. S. Jo. Chrysost. c. 91.
See Dr. Cave's *Life of St Chrysost.* p. 496.

V. And this they did, not only when they were weak and unable to help themselves, but when greatly multiplied, and in all appearance capacitated to withstand whatever Forces should be brought against them. Thus much may fairly be inferred from what I have offered under the last head ; and the Reader must be in a good measure satisfied of it already. For if there were such Multitudes that from time to time suffered for the sake of Christ, their Strength and Power must needs be answerable to their Numbers, and consequently very formidable, had they been at liberty to shew what they could do. But however I have other, and more direct and positive Proof of this Truth.

And the first Evidence I shall produce is of one already named, no Christian, but a Persecutor of them under *Trajan*, though both more pitiful and compassionate to them than other Persecutors, I mean *Pliny*, who in (a) the forecited famous Epistle to the Emperor informs him, not only what great Numbers had suffered, and were still ready to suffer the utmost Extremities, rather than sacrifice to the *Roman* Deities, nor only that they had overspread the whole Country, but moreover they had filled all places to that degree, that the *Heathenish Temples had been almost quite forsaken, so that they had been forced to forbear their wonted Solemnities.* Which must imply the Christians to be far the major part of the People at that time, at least in *Bithynia* where he presided, and from whence he wrote. And this is a Testimony that well deserves to be attended to. For if we could suppose the Christian Writers to have been partial in their Representations, and to have magnified their own Strength beyond its due proportion, which yet is not easily to be supposed, considering not only their own Integrity and Sincerity, but to whom they addressed their Apologies, and how easily they might have been confuted if what they said had not been true ; supposing, I say, they had been so false and foolish together, it cannot be imagined that *Pliny* should have

(a) *L. 10. Ep. 97.*

have been under the same Byass, but what he has related concerning them must needs be allowed for Truth. And if so, their Strength appears to have been very considerable, and such as would have tempted many others in the like hard circumstances, to behave themselves very differently to their Governors, from what these always did. But let us hear the Christians speaking of themselves.

Eusebius is positive as to both their Numbers and their Extent, giving us hereby to understand how little reason there is to imagine them so thinly sown as that they might not have promised themselves good hope of success in an Insurrection. For speaking of our Blessed Saviour, (a) he adds, That *his saving Word like a Sun-beam enlightened the whole World, the Sound of the Holy Evangelists and Apostles going out, as had been foretold of them in the Holy Scriptures, into all Lands, and their Speech unto the Ends of the Earth. So that throughout all Cities and Villages sprang up Churches, abounding with an immense Multitude of Believers.*

And *Tertullian* notes it as a common Complaint in his days, that they were exceedingly increased, and were like to be yet more so. (b) *Obsessam vociferantur civitatem, &c.* They, their Enemies, cry out that the City is invested by them, and that they abound in the Countries, in the Castles, in the Isles; and it is sadly lamented as a woful Misfortune, that all Sexes, Ages, States, and Conditions went over to them. And again, the same *Tertullian* professes, That (c) in one Night's time they could have sufficiently revenged themselves upon their Persecutors, if they had been permitted to return Evil for Evil. And he desires the Governors to bethink themselves, Whether such a powerful Body as the Christians then were, might not have stood upon their own Defence, and whether they had not force enough, not only for surprizing their Enemies by clandestine Conspiracies, and sudden and unexpected Assaults, but for engaging them openly in

H 3

the

(a) Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 3.

(b) Apol. c. 1.

(c) C. 37.

the Field of Battle ; adding farther that all places were stuffed and crouded with them, so numerous were they grown in a little time ; besides that the little regard that they had for their own Lives, gave them the more power over those of others. As I shall have occasion to observe somewhat more particularly, when I come to enquire into Mr. *H*'s. Exceptions against the irrefragable Testimony of *Tertullian*, in behalf of the Doctrine I am contending for. And in his Address to *Scapula*, (a) He attests the Christians to be almost the greater part of every City, and of each Sex, every Age, and all Degrees, the highest and next under the Emperor himself not excepted.

Whereto agrees what *Justin Martyr* urges against *Trypho*, (b) That there was no sort of People, Barbarians, or Greeks, or of whatsoever denomination, not *Hamaxobii*, the Nomades, or of such as had no Houses, but dwelt in Tents only, that did not offer up their Praises and Thanksgivings to the Father and Maker of all things, through the Name of the crucified Jesus.

And *S. Cyprian* speaks full to our purpose, in his Address to *Demetrian* Proconsul of *Africa*. (c) Leave off abusing the Servants of God and Christ, with thy Persecutions, whom, after all the mischief thou canst do to them, the Divine Vengeance will protect. For this reason it is that when apprehended, none of us makes Oppositions, nor revenges himself upon your unjust Violence, *quamvis nimius & copiosus noster sit populus*, though we are more than enough, a strong and powerful Body; hereby intimating to him their Ability to deal with him, if they had not been restrained from it.

Thus likewise says *Lactantius*, (d) From East to West, from the rising to the setting Sun, the Divine Law is received ; and each Sex, as well as every Age, People and Nation, serve God with one and the same Mind, and every where is the same Patience, and the same Contempt of Death. Whence it naturally follows, that though Christianity had thus wonderfully overspread the face of the Earth, their

(a) Ad Scap. c. 2.

(b) P. 345.

(c) P. 192.

(d) Inst. l. 5. c. 13.

their Numbers and Strength were no encouragement to them, to stand up forcibly for themselves against their merciless Governors. Whom because they knew it not lawful to oppose, they chose rather to dye with Patience and Resignation to the Divine Will, than take upon them to right themselves against his Ministers, how unworthy soever of that high Office.

The same is taught also by *S. Augustin*, delivering it as an undoubted Truth, That (a) *the City of God, though dwelling like Strangers upon Earth, and having vast Stores of People on their side, nevertheless would not fight against their wicked persecuting Princes for their temporal Safety, but rather abstained from all Resistance, in order to a state of eternal Happiness, and submitted to be put in Chains, Imprisoned, Beaten, Tortured, Burnt, Butchered, and Slain.* On which Words *Ludovicus Vives* thus comments. *They were in a condition to have made head against their Enemies, and if they would have betaken themselves to Arms and stood upon their Defence, might not only have terrified, but brought them into danger. But they accounted it far better, and more becoming the Professors of the Gospel, to Suffer than to do any Injury, to be Killed than Kill, to lose their Bodies than their Souls.*

But the fullest Instance I know to this purpose is of *Julian's* Army. I dare say *Mr. H.* will not reckon this Apostate amongst those good Governors, whom he allows to have God's Authority, and a Right to their Subjects Obedience upon this account. Yet his Christian Soldiers not only fought for him against his Enemies, but owned themselves bound to be subject to, and obey him, out of a Principle of religious Loyalty, and because of the Power he had received from God. They served him faithfully, and were ready to go upon any Expedition he ordered them. And when any of them were condemned to suffer for their Religion, they did it as readily, as if they could no way have prevented it. And yet what their Strength and Ability was, appears evidently from their confession to *Jovian*, upon his coming

H 4

ing

ing to the Crown, That they were all of the same Religion with himself. They heard him, when chosen Emperor upon the death of *Julian*, refuse to accept of that Dignity, (a) because being a *Christian*, he knew not how to take upon him the Command of a Heathen Army. But they soon removed this difficulty, assuring him this was no cause of Refusal, for he might depend upon it, they were not what he supposed them to be, but were ALL CHRISTIANS as well as himself. *Fear not, O Emperor, say they, nor reject the Command over us, upon account of our Impiety. For you will have Christians for your Subjects, who have been educated in the Doctrines of the True Religion.* As Mr. H. might have seen in the Authors themselves; or nearer at hand in the learned Dr. *Hicks's* Preface to his unanswerable *Jovian*. Yet had these same Christians served under the Apostate *Julian*, when they had it every day in their power, to rid themselves of him. Though he was an (b) Apostate, and a Tyrant, an irreconcilable Enemy to, and Persecutor of Christianity; (c) and as he was later in time, so was more intolerable in his Persecutions, than either *Dioctesian* who began to fall foul upon the Christians, or *Maximian* who followed and exceeded him, or *Maximin*, who as he came after, so he surpassed them both in Cruelty. So that says *Gregory Nazianzen*, (d) he might justly be called *Jeroboam*, or *Ahab*, or *Pharaoh*, or *Nebuchadnezzar*, or all of them together, as having the Apostacy of the one, the Blood-guiltiness of the next, the Hardheartedness of the third, and the Sacrilege of the last. He was in *S. Chrysostom's* language, (e) βασιλεὺς ἀσεβεία νικῶν τὰς ἐμπροσθεν πάντας, a greater instance of Impiety than all the Emperors that had been before him. Yet all the while his Army had such a sense of their Duty to him as their Sovereign, that all this did

(a) Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 22. Sozom. l. 6. c. 3. Theodorit. l. 4. c. 1.

(b) *Julianus* extitit infidelis Imperator, nonne extitit Apostata, iniquus, Idololatra? B. Aug. in Psalm. 124.

(c) Greg. Naz. in Jul. Orat. 3. p. 93.

(d) Orat. 4. p. 110.

(e) Orat. in Juvent. & Max. To. 5. p. 533.

did not hinder them from being faithful and obedient, and ready to fulfil all his just and lawful Orders and Commands. (a) When he would have them violate the Laws of their Blessed Saviour, they stuck to their Religion, and acknowledged no Lord in that case, but him who is in Heaven; when he required them to worship Idols, and offer Incense, they shewed themselves to stand in greater awe of God, than of him. But when he bade them lead forth the Army, and go against such or such a Nation, they forthwith obeyed. They knew how to distinguish between their Eternal, and their Temporal Lord, and yet were subject to their Temporal Lord for the sake of him that is Eternal. They remembered the relation that, notwithstanding all his Wickedness and ill Government, he yet bare to Almighty God, as appointed to Govern under him, and upon this account thought themselves obliged to honour and be subject to him, and not to requite his unconscionable Usage of them, by an undutiful Behaviour towards him.

If Resistance were lawful in any case, as Sir Dudley Diggs well argues, (b) never Men could have brought fairer Pleas. Julian was an Apostate from the Established True Religion, he dealt with Sorcerers and Magicians, and professed against doing justice to the Christians, making sport with their Injuries, and returning no other answer to their Tears and humble Petitions, but such Scoffs as these; “ It is
 “ part of your Religion to be abused; you forget the
 “ Galilean’s Precept, Why do you not rather suffer Wrong?
 “ You must forgive all Offences against you, as you
 “ hope to be forgiven; if they strike you on one Cheek,
 “ you are bound to turn the other also; if they take
 “ away your Cloaks, that gives them a just title to
 “ your Coats too; if at least he whom you worship have
 “ power to dispose of your Goods, you are bound from
 “ going to Law, and rendring Evil for Evil; why do
 “ you petition against, who are bound to pray for your
 “ Persecutors? If they take away your Revenues, they
 “ ad-

(a) B. Aug. in Psalm. 124.

(b) Unlawfulness of Subjects taking up Arms, p. 102.

“ advance you into the State of Perfection, which requires you should not possess any thing, &c.” Thus they were more persecuted by his Wit than his Cruelty; and though he did even wanton in their Miseries, his barbarous Usage could not prevail with them to neglect their Calling, but they committed themselves to him who judgeth righteously; and he revenged their causeless Sufferings, in his destruction; for as stricken from Heaven, he cryed out, O Galilean, Thou hast got the better.

So that we may justly conclude with Dr. Hickes in his learned *Jovian*, (a) That there never were greater Examples of Passive-obedience, than in this short Reign of Julian, whose Christian Subjects and Soldiers, tho’ far more numerous than in any Age before them, not only patiently endured many grievous Miseries, but, what was the most provoking and grievous of all Miseries, they daily heard and saw themselves, their Religion, and their blessed Saviour, most blasphemously scorned and reviled. Though he was an Apostate that was their Persecutor, and they had their Religion like a Treasure wrested out of their Hands, by one that had been bred in the Bosom of the Church, yet all the Armour they used against him were the old primitive Arms of Prayers and Tears. (b) It seems neither the Defence of their Laws, nor Religion, nor Fellow-Christians, nor the preventing the Effusion of Innocent Blood, could make them Resist the worst of Tyrants. (c) He knew they would rather dye than Resist him; he knew that Passive-obedience was their Principle, and this made him so secure of them, and so bold to abuse them, their Religion, and their Saviour, although they were so numerous, that (d) the Magistrates in every City, were scarce able to take the numbers of those that refused to sacrifice. The truth is, they had such a sense of their Duty impressed upon their Minds, that all the vilest Treatment could not withdraw them from it. Neither Scoffs nor Frowns, Jeers nor Torments, could inspire them with any thoughts of Rebelling against the Lord’s Anointed, how outrageous soever in his carriage towards them.

(a) P. 176.

(b) P. 180.

(c) P. 183.

d. Sozom. l. 5. c. 15. & Socrat. l. 3. c. 20.

them. They were for Suffering rather than Sinning, not only under the sorest Provocations, but the most promising Temptations. And as at other times, so particularly, as Bishop *Bilson* observes of them to their immortal Honour, (a) when they had this insulting Emperor in his Voyage against the *Persians*, far from home, and from any that might assist and defend him, and were so much stronger than he, that they could immediately have done with him whatever they would, yet they chose rather to spend their Lives for him, than lift up their Hands against him. And the Christian World in his absence stirred not against him, but with Patience endured his Oppression, and with Silence expected his Return.

The like he observes also of *Valens*, (b) That against him the Church of Christ had Forces abundant, if she would have sounded or used them. For all the time of his Reign, not only the West-Empire were Catholics, first *Valentinian*, and after him *Gratian*; but *Procopius* at *Constantinople*, taking Arms against *Valens*, and the *Goths* detaining all *Thracia* from him, gave the Christians great advantage to have shaken him clean out of the East-Empire, if their Wills had been answerable unto their Strength.

So that none who traces these ancient Christians from time to time, and compares their Strength and their Behaviour together, but must be sensible, that no Pretence can be more vain and groundless, than that of *Bellarmino*, and others since, That (c) the only reason why the Christians did not heretofore depose *Nero*, and *Dioclesian*, and *Julian the Apostate*, and *Valens the Arian*, and others like them, was their want of Power to do it. For hereby it is undeniable, that they were very strong, and had besides sometimes such convenient opportunities of delivering themselves out of the Hands of their persecuting Princes, that nothing but a sense of their Duty could withhold them from it. They had overspread the Empire, had extended themselves from East to West, had emptied the idolatrous Temples, had lifted them-

selves

(a) *Of Christian Subjection*. Part. 3. p. 404. (b.) *Ibid*.

(c) *Id fecit quia deerant vires temporales Christianis. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 5. c. 7.*

selves in the Army, and got into Posts of Command, and had the Emperor upon some occasions, as much at their disposal, as *David* had *Saul* in his, either (a) at the Cave at Engedi, or (b) in the Wilderness of Ziph. And if it was not yet in their power to make sure of him, if they durst have attempted it, it is impossible to tell how it ever could be.

VI. And lastly, If it be objected, that it were possible, though they be allowed to have had Strength, and presumed to have had good Will enough to Resist, they might yet forbear for want of some to head them, so as that they might hope for a probability at least, of success in such an Attempt; to this I answer, That whatsoever possibility might be of this, it is very far from being a true state of the case. For they had such sometimes in Arms, as would have been heartily glad of their Assistance, and would no doubt have given them all the Encouragement they could well desire. Such was *Procopius* at *Constantinople*, in the Reign of *Valens*, just now mentioned. And such likewise had been (c) *Clodius Albinus* in *France*, and (d) *Pescennius*, or *Pescenninus Niger*, set up by the *Syrian Legions*, both of them in the Reign of *Severus*; and (e) *Ausidius*, or *Avidius Cassius*, in the time of *Marcus Antoninus* in *Syria*. All who having raised Commotions in the Empire, it cannot be thought but they would have been glad of all the Help they could get against the Emperor. So that had the Christians had any inclination to Rebel, they could never have hoped for a fitter opportunity, than when they saw any of these already in Arms. And their Strength added to the Forces already engaged under such experienced Leaders, could not fail in all human appearance, to set them free from their present Grievances, and possibly to lay a lasting foundation of Ease

(a) 1 Sam. 24. 3, 4.

(b) Ch. 26. 7.

(c) Jul. Capitolin. in Clod. Alb. & Æl. Spartian. in Pescenn. Nigro.

(d) Aurel. Viſt. Epit. & Pamel. in Tertull. ad Scap. c. 2.

(e) Vulcat. in vit. Av. Cass. Xiphil. in Marc. Anton. Philos. & Jul. Capitolin. in Cass.

Ease and Quiet to their Posterity after them. Yet notwithstanding whatsoever prospect of this nature they might have, *Tertullian* glories in it as an undeniable Evidence of their steady Fidelity to their Princes, that they struck in with none of these movers of Rebellion. He boasts in his eloquent Apology for them, (a) That the *Cassuses*, *Nigers*, and *Albinuses* were not from among them. And pleads in their Justification before the Prefect *Scapula*, (b) That no Christians were ever found to be Accomplices with their Followers; That they had no *Nigrians*, *Albinians*, or *Cassians* amongst the Professors of the Gospel. No, under all their heaviest Pressures, and the worst Usage they received; and not only so, but under their most encouraging Temptations to Resistance, they were alway mindful of their Duty. They considered that they were Christians, and accordingly stood bound to follow their Saviour's Precepts and Example. Hence they constantly chose rather to expose themselves to the utmost Barbarities, than take any undue and unlawful course to right themselves; as they knew that of Resisting the Higher Powers to be.

Nor were these all the Commanders they might have promised themselves to head them in an Insurrection, could they have believed it lawful; but as *Dr. Hickes* well argues, (c) They might have had others from amongst themselves, Men of Interest, Experience, and Courage; for, besides the open and concealed Christians that were in *Julian's Army*, there were many great and popular Men among the Legions turned out of their Employments, as *Jovian*, *Valentinian*, and *Valens*, who might have set up the Holy Standard, which *Julian* had taken down, and soon have got an Army of Christians, if *Julian's Christian Soldiers* or Subjects, barbarously used as they were, had thought it lawful to Rebel. The two former especially had such interest in *Julian's own Army*, that they were successively chosen Emperors by it, within eight Months after his Death; and considering how spitefully the whole Christian Clergy had been used by *Julian*, the Christians outraged by the Heathens, the
Christian

(a) C. 35. (b) Ad Scap. c. 2. (c) *Jovian*. p. 171, 172.

Christian Soldiers discontented, so many Christian Cities disfranchised, and such brave and noble Commanders to head the numberless Sufferers of all sorts, it is most absurd to ascribe their peaceable and suffering Behaviour to want of Strength, Numbers, or Opportunity; and difficult to imagine, had they thought Resistance lawful, but that having all these advantages, they should at least have attempted to Rebel. It were hard indeed to apprehend, how they should be able to restrain themselves from seeking to cast off their Yoke, and should so patiently acquiesce under it, had it not proceeded from the Principles of their Religion. And it will be impossible to give any other tolerable account of it, but that their Minds were set upon another better Life, which they were unwilling in any wise to endanger, for the sake of this World's Ease or Security, whether Personal or Social.

Thus I have shewn somewhat more largely than I at first designed, how exemplary the Patience, Submission, and Obedience of the primitive Christians was, and how unlike theirs who both teach and practice Resistance of Authority, when they apprehend it to be for their temporal Safety and Advantage. These Blessed Saints, taught to fear their Sovereign as God's Ordinance, and as reigning by his Commission, and not to Revile or Reproach him, much less forcibly oppose him, but Honour and be subject to him, and observe all his Lawful Commands, praying for him, and desiring his Welfare, and choosing much rather to dye by the Magistrate's Order, and in obedience to their Saviour's Laws, and the Injunctions of his Apostles, than to save their Lives by the use of forbidden means. They exhorted their Fellow-Christians to keep in mind the Apostle's Admonition about *studying to be Quiet*, and to raise no Tumults amongst their Brethren, but always prefer a Crown of Martyrdom abundantly before the utmost earthly Happiness. They declared their Sovereign to have God's Commission, and to be next under God, and by consequence accountable to Him only, and not to any, or all of the People, who being but Subjects, could have no Authority over him to whom the supreme Lord of all had put them in subjection.

They

They owned Religion was to be defended; yet not by Fighting, but by Dying for it. And when they suffered to the greatest degree, they contented themselves only to commit their Cause to God, and leave it to his infinitely Wise Determination. They understood their Religion too well to think, that because their Prince transgressed his Duty towards them, they might also transgress theirs towards him; because he had abused, and oppressed them, they might take up Arms against him; because he had invaded their Rights, they might Depose him, and rob him of his. This is a sort of Casuistry that might besit a *Bellarmino*, a *Doleman*, a *Creswell*, or a *Milton*, a *Johnson*, a *Toland*, or a *Locke*; but was utterly unknown to the *Tertullians*, the *Cyprians*, the *Chrysostoms*, and the *Augustins*, and all the Writers of the first and purest Ages of the Church. These did not imagine any Wickedness of their Sovereign would authorize them to be wicked too; that his Injuring them would justify their Injuring him; or that because he shewed himself a Tyrant, they might therefore be Traytors or Rebels. They professed their only Weapons against their Superiours to be *Prayers* and *Tears*; and that whosoever *Resists the Higher Powers*, fights against God, who has enjoined Obedience to them.

And as their Doctrines were thus for Submission and Non-resistance in all cases, so were their Practices accordingly; as all that are any ways acquainted with the History of those Times must be forced to acknowledge. For as they *made Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and Giving of Thanks for Kings and all in Authority*, so did they patiently bear with the hardest Usage they met with from them.

When they were stript of their Honours and Privileges, were Whipt, were Beaten, had their Flesh harrowed and torn, their Limbs upon the Rack, their whole Bodies upon the Gridiron, or in the Fire, were Imprisoned, put in Chains, Crucified, devoured by Beasts, were Thrown headlong, Drowned, Pulled in pieces, sent into Exile, or condemned to the Mines, were Starved, Hung up, Beheaded; when they underwent these,
and

and divers other the most horrid sorts of Punishments; and not for any Crimes they were guilty of, but merely upon the account of their Religion, and not only according to Law, but many times directly against it, they were far from permitting them all to transport them beyond their Duty. All this and a great deal more they patiently submitted to, and many times against all pretence of Law, as well as Justice, and when great Numbers of them suffered together, and moreover when they had strength enough to have prevented it, and the most favourable opportunities and advantages for such a design, if they had not been tied up by the Laws of the Gospel, forbidding all Attempts upon their Princes, as highly displeasing to Almighty God, and of pernicious and destructive consequence to themselves, not improbably in this, but most certainly in the other World. Thus by *Faith and Patience they inherited the Promises*. A method, which as Dr. *Hammond* well observes, (a) is *most irreconcilable with forcible Resistance*. And the Gospel has never prescribed us a different behaviour under Trials and Sufferings, from what it did to them. As I am next to shew.

S E C T. III.

What Obligation we are under to the Passive Imitation of these Devout and Heavenly minded Christians.

THAT we are all to be *Followers of them as they were*, not only of *S. Paul*, and the other Apostles, but of *Christ* himself, is what no good Christian can deny. And that they were thus *Followers of Christ*, is plain from their suffering after his Example, and in obedience to his Command; who has himself enjoined *to render to Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's*, and by his Apostle has threatened *Damnation to such as Resist the Higher Powers*. This I have so fully proved in the former Chapter, that I shall not need to insist upon it here. All there-

(a) *Of Resisting the Lawful Magistrate*. p. 304.

therefore **h** design in this place is briefly to observe,

I. In what sense they understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the point of Resistance.

II. What indispensable Obligation they thought themselves under to behave themselves accordingly.

III. How loudly the Pattern they have set us calls for an undaunted Imitation of them.

I. In what sense they understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures as to the point of Resistance. Now had they thought it lawful to Resist in any case, their Provocations to it were neither so rare, nor so light, but that it may rationally be presumed, they would have been sometimes at least, if not frequently in Arms, to try what Relief they could give themselves, against the many Pressures they groaned under, and Dangers whereto they were exposed. It might have been expected likewise that they would have encouraged others to the like Attempts, or at least would have been sure to vindicate their own Principles, and shew the rest of the World, that they had no reason to believe *an unlimited Subjection* to be due to Princes, as well when they go contrary to, as when they *answer the good End of their Institution*. It could not be, upon this supposition, but some of them would, at some time or other, have published their Sentiments, for the Instruction and Satisfaction of others, as well as to justify themselves; namely, *That if those who are placed in Authority for the Good and Happiness of Mankind, use their Power to any other purpose, to the Hurt and Prejudice of Human Society, to oppose them in such a case cannot be to oppose the Authority of God. Nay a Passive Non-resistance would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* This is (a) Mr. H's, Doctrine, and would no doubt have been the Doctrine too of these Christian Worthies, if they had interpreted the Words of our Saviour, and his Apostles, to as odd a sense as he does. But they *had not so learned Christ*. They thought

I

it

it necessary to take the Words of Scripture in their most genuine Meaning, and not press them to serve an Hypothesis, how plausible soever any might apprehend it in order to the peace and quiet of this Life. They knew the Old Testament had condemned all Disobedience to, and Resistance of Authority, or so much as to Revile, or but wish Harm to Governors; and that the New had taught to be *subject to Principalities and Powers, and obey Magistrates* in general, the Bad as well as the Good, the Wicked as well as the Righteous, with a Reservation indeed for Non-compliance with their sinful and unjust Commands, but with none for Resistance in case they attended not continually, as they ought, to that very thing for which they were set in such high Station, nor even when they acted contrary to the End of their Institution, invaded the Rights of their Subjects, and attempted the Ruin of the Society over which they were placed. For which reason they could by no means go about to persuade the World, that the sole End of Government was the Good and Happiness of Society, and when Princes act contrary to this, and so deflect from God's Will, which is declared to be the promoting the Publick Good, they lose their title to the Apostle S. Paul's Declarations, and are no longer to be looked upon as the Ordinance of God. Search all their Writings, their Epistles, their Apologies, their Commentaries, their Devotional, Catechetical, Controversial Discourses, their Sermons, their Histories, their Councils, search all these from the beginning to the end, and from one Age to another, as far as I have undertaken to trace their Steps, and it may be farther, and you will never find any thing like this; but on the contrary, they were all Patience and Subjection, and own their Religion to be a Suffering Religion, and themselves prepared accordingly to enter through many Tribulations into the Kingdom of Heaven. They never gave out, that the Divine Authority of Magistrates, and the Usefulness of their Office to Human Society, were not really two distinct Arguments, for enforcing the Duty of Submission to Governors, or that S. Paul resolves all into the latter. But when he told them, there was no Power but of God, and the Powers that
were,

were, were ordained of God, and for this reason *whosoever resisted the Power, by so doing resisted the Ordinance of God, and without a timely and sincere Repentance must expect to be Damned for it, they verily believed he meant as the Words import, and as every impartial Reader must necessarily understand them to mean, That Magistracy is to be submitted to, not only upon account of its Usefulness to Society, but as it is God's Ordinance, and bears his Stamp and Impression, and cannot therefore be slighted and disobeyed without an apparent Breach of his Command, and incurring the Guilt and Danger of Disobedience to his Authority. Hence all their Writings treat only of Submission and Patience, and Resignation to the Divine Will, even under the courtest Usage, and the heaviest Pressures and Calamities, without any intimation of the Lawfulness of Resistance, or any encouragement for Subjects to consult the supposed temporal Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by Opposing such Governors. As Mr. H. must be forced to own, till he can bring at least one good Instance to the contrary; which he has not yet done. This is enough to shew in what sense these Primitive Martyrs and Confessors understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the point of Obedience; and that they could not doubt but their Subjection was due to Governors in general, and more particularly to such wicked and tyrannical Governors, as our Saviour and his Apostles lived and died under, and who were the Powers in being at that time. To this purpose not only Epiphanius teaches, That (a) the Powers of the World are ordained of God, and have received the Power of the Sword for vengeance; and S. Ambrose (b) That this is spoken against such as think themselves too powerful to be brought to legal Punishment; therefore he shews them that it is what God's Law requires, and they must not hope to avoid his Judgment, howsoever they may possibly escape for a while; and Irenaeus speaking of wicked and tyrannical Kings,*

I 2

says,

(a) Hæres. XL. c. 4.

(b) In loc.

says, (a) *They shall perish by the just Judgment of God,* without the least intimation of their being any way accountable to their Subjects; but *Origen* (b) plainly owns wicked and persecuting Powers to be from God, and refers them for their Punishment to God's just Judgment, as *Irenaus* had done before. And though in treating on the next Verse he says, the Apostle does not speak of such Powers as persecute the Faith, I cannot understand him to mean more than that an active Obedience is not to be given to such, because otherwise I cannot see the force of the reason given of this Assertion, *That God is to be obeyed rather than Man.* And if Mr. H. can put any other Construction upon the Words, and give a good Reason for it, I shall be willing to be instructed by him. *Theodoret* (c) takes bad Kings to be sent by God, as a Punishment to a wicked People. And *S. Chrysostom* (d) declares those that are not subject, *To resist God, and prepare for themselves sore Evils, both from God and Man.* These and others of the Fathers do not indeed scholastically define the Extent of this Duty; it having not been then disputed, they do not each one nicely state the limits of it. But yet amongst them they teach that these earthly Powers are ordained of God, even wicked Persecuting Powers are sent as a Punishment to a wicked People, and such as are not subject to them, must expect to be punished for it both by God and Man. I proceed next to shew,

II. What indispensable Obligation they thought themselves under, and how necessarily it was required of them, to behave themselves accordingly. And this is easily to be collected from their constant Practice, and the wonderful Readiness, wherewith they all along submitted to the Hardships that were put upon them, by their cruel and persecuting Emperors; such as Flesh and Blood had the utmost aversion to, and must inevitably have recoiled from, and sought by all means possible to avoid, if they had not been under the influence of a higher

(a) Adv. Hæres. l. 5. c. 24.

(b) In loc.

(c) In loc.

(d) In loc.

higher Principle, and had greater and better Hopes and Expectations to support them under all those Conflicts. They had their Senses about them, as well as others; and Poverty, Pain, and Death must doubtless have made the same Impressions upon them, as upon their Neighbours round about them, and put them upon the same Methods that others were so prone to, for their own Preservation, had it not been that they had more regard for the Soul than for the Body, for another Eternal State than for this short, transitory, uncertain Life, and looked upon it as matter of infinitely greater Concernment to them, to *escape the Damnation of Hell*, than to deliver themselves from the Fury of the most insatiably blood-thirsty Tyrant. And knowing moreover that *Damnation* was expressly threaten'd to such as *Resist the Higher Powers*, they thought any Attempts of that nature to be as much as their Souls were worth, and durst therefore upon no account engage in them. They considered what Religion they were of, and whose Disciples they professed themselves to be; and this naturally led them to the imitation of that Meek, and Holy Example he had set them, and the conscientious observance of all the Laws he had prescribed them, and this of Submission to Authority amongst the rest. They could not think themselves at liberty to *break* any the least of his Commands; especially not one that had *Damnation* so particularly annexed to the violation of it. They were truly sensible of the unquestionably supreme Authority of the Imposer, together with the solemn Covenant and Stipulation they had entered into with him at their Baptism, which no worldly Considerations whatever could cancel, and for the Observance whereof they must certainly be called to account at the last Day.

And how singularly careful they were, to fulfil what they had thus undertaken, and what a dreadful Notion they had of the Breach of it, may justly be inferred from the behaviour of *Julian's* Soldiers in another case. Of whom *Gregory Nazianzen* gives this remarkable account; That when they had not wilfully departed from their

Duty, but been purely tricked into the transgression of it, without the least apprehension of what they were doing, they were no sooner made sensible of their Sin, but they were almost besides themselves at the discovery. The case in short was this. (a) The Emperor, on a certain day, appointed for the distribution of his Bounty to his Soldiers, had commanded them all to be present, to accept of the several Kindnesses he designed them, according to their Merits. And being royally adorned, and majestically seated upon his Throne, with heaps of Gold, and Frankincense, and a Fire before him, each one was directed as he came, to throw a little Frankincense into the Fire, as a Ceremony then expected from them, and which was usual upon such occasions. *This most of them ignorantly complied with, not imagining any Guilt contracted by it, or (b) that it tended to their destruction.* Till at length being told they had herein denied Christ, and worshiped Idols, they were hereupon immediately struck with Terror, and became like Men half dead ; running forth, as if they were distracted, and publicly crying out, and bemoaning themselves, and declaring before God and Men, that they were (c) *unfeigned Christians.* And hastening to the Emperor, they threw down the Money, with sad complaints of the horrid Abuse he had put upon them, supplicating him to put them to death, as they had deserved, and to cut off their *Hands* with which they had received his Gold, and their *Feet* that had brought them to partake of it. Such was their Zeal, for maintaining their Fidelity to their *only Lord and Saviour*, above all the Earthly Advantages they could possibly propound to themselves.

And we may depend upon it, that this was not a particular Case, nor these Men only thus nearly concerned for their Religion, but they and others had the same regard for other parts of their Duty, and did accordingly in all respects *exercise themselves to have Con-*
sciences

(a) ΣΤΗΛΙΤΔ'Τ. α. p. 46, 47, 48.

(b) Οὐδὲ πῶς ἑαυτῶν σφαγῶν εἰδότες οἱ πλείους.

(c) χριστιανοὶ, χριστιανοὶ τῆς ψυχῆς.

sciences void of Offence, both towards God, and towards Man, and would not stick to part with all they enjoyed here, and to lay down their dearest Lives for their Saviour's sake, whensoever they conceived it to be for his Glory. To serve God aright, whatever it cost them, was the main study of their Lives. It was their Meat and Drink, (4) as it had been their blessed Lord's, *to do the Will of their Heavenly Father*, without attending to the present Evils they might probably, and perhaps certainly bring upon themselves by it. And multitudes of them never seemed better pleased, than when they were called to part with all they had, and to suffer and dye for the sake of a good Conscience.

And therefore being, as I have observed, fully convinced of the Doctrines of Christianity in point of Obedience to Authority, they could not fail to testify the Obligation they were under from them at all times, and even under the most prevalent Temptations they met with to the contrary. That they did thus behave themselves, I have shewn I hope beyond contradiction. And no other reason of their doing it can be assigned, but that Sense of Duty they had upon their Souls, which would not allow them to do otherwise. They were mindful of the Injunctions that had been given them, their own Vows and Promises to observe them, the Hope that was set before them, and the dreadful Threatnings of *Wrath and fiery Indignation to devour* the Refractory and Disobedient, and could not find in their Hearts to break through all these, to avoid some outward temporal Inconvenience, or Danger. And now I shall not need to be long in shewing,

III. How loudly the Pattern they have set us, calls for an undaunted imitation of it. For if we aim at the same blessed State whither they are gone before, and whereto they were so earnestly desirous to be advanced, though in a Chariot of Fire, or through a Sea of Blood, we must be content to follow them the same way, if it shall please God in his good Providence to call us to it.

We are not bound to court Sufferings from whatever hand, but may safely use all fair and honest ways for escaping them; *when persecuted in one City, may flee into another*, (a) as our Saviour directs, and (b) as the primitive Christians many times did, may privately withdraw and conceal ourselves, may sue for favour and pity, and try by a patient submission to win upon, and pacify our Persecutors, but must not go out of God's way to save ourselves, nor seek to prevent their utimost Fury, by the use of forbidden Arms, or any other method not agreeable to his Word and Will. We have not another Gospel, from what the Primitive Professors of our Faith had, nor another Reward offered us, and to be obtained upon other Terms. Wherefore if we would shew ourselves true Disciples of the same Lord with them, and would hope for the same inestimable Prize they have so happily obtained, we must inevitably be prepared to tread the same Steps, and run the same Race with them; and must no more be terrified out of our Integrity, by whatsoever appearance of Danger, than they were.

And indeed who can reflect upon those Words of our blessed Saviour, (c) *Whosoever shall deny me before men,* which every one interpretatively does, that chooseth Sin, the Sin of Resistance as well as any other, before Suffering, *him will I deny before my Father which is in Heaven,* who, I say, can reflect upon these Words of our Saviour, and not be willing to dye with him, if occasion for it should offer itself, as these heavenly-minded Christians did? Who can observe S. Polycarp professing (d) an immovable Dependence upon God, and repelling the Proconsul's motion, to save his Life by Swearing, and Reviling Christ, with this Reply; (e) *These eighty and six years I have served him, and he never did me any hurt; how shall I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?* and as it is added

(a) S. Mat. 10. 23.

(b) B. Athanas. Apol. de fugâ suâ.

(c) S. Matt. 10. 33.

(d) Eccl. Smyrn. Epist. c. 9.

(e) Ὁ γδοήκοντα καὶ ἑξήκτι ἐτὶ ἔχω δουλεύων αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔδεν με ἡδίκησεν· καὶ πῶς δυνάμει βλασφημῆσαι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, τὸ σώσαντά με; *ibid.*

added in the *Latin Translation*, *the Persecutor of the Wicked, and the Avenger of the Righteous*; or *S. Ignatius* entreating his Friends not to use any endeavours for putting off his death; out of an unseasonable and mistaken kindness to him, but that they would (a) *let the Beasts devour him, that so he might attain to the Enjoyment of God, proclaiming himself to be God's Grain, and that he wanted to be ground by the Beasts Teeth to make him the pure Bread of Christ*, and desiring they would set on the Beasts to bury him in their Bowels; or (b) *Felix of Tubyza* assuring the Proconsul *Anulinus* of his being a Christian, and a Bishop, and that he would upon no terms deliver up his Bible, and again affirming the same thing to the Prefect at *Nola*; or *Justin Martyr* glorying in behalf of the Christians in general, (c) *That they could undergo the utmost Severities rather than offer Sacrifice, and could rejoice in Dying upon so good an account, in a firm Expectation of an abundant Reward for it?* Who, can observe these, and innumerable other like Expressions of an unfeigned Duty to our Lord, a hearty Zeal for his Glory, and an earnest Desire of a full Enjoyment of him, and not have their Minds raised above the things of this World, and their Wills fixed, and all the Faculties of their Souls engaged, neither to decline any Sufferings upon their Lord's account, nor undutifully resist their Superiours, when the unhappy Instruments of them?

These glorious Saints were noble Patterns of true Christian Piety and Patience. And nothing can better become us, than to shew forth the same Meekness and Constancy with them, and be ready upon all occasions, to suffer with as much undaunted Courage, and yet with as little Opposition as they did. Nor can the Refusal of this be justified, unless it could have been proved, that they sinned in suffering themselves to be so inhumanly Butchered, and did not rather unite their Forces, and struggle for the Preservation of their Lives, and the
Lives

(a) Epist. ad Rom. c. 4.

(b) Pass. S. Felicis. ep. Tubyz. edit. Oxon. 1680.

(c) Tryph. p. 265, 323, 337, 349, 360.

Lives and Welfare of their Posterity. Which is a Charge I hope Mr. *H.* will not pretend to draw up against them; and which I am sure neither he, nor any one else would ever be able to make good. I cannot think he will venture to arraign these excellent Worthies as Enemies to the Good of Human Society, to their Religion, themselves, and all that should come after them; only because their Minds, their Thoughts and Desires were set above all things, upon serving, and pleasing, and approving themselves to God here, and enjoying him eternally hereafter, in that unspeakable Bliss and Felicity, which he has promis'd to all that duly labour after it. How much more reasonable would it be for him, and all of us, to consider, that *having here no abiding City*, we are infinitely concerned to seek after another that is better and more lasting, and to receive all the ill Usage we meet with in our Passage towards it, with the same calmness and serenity of Mind, and the same Submission and Non-resistance which was so remarkable in them, and for which their Memory has been so deservedly honoured ever since?

Examples are a powerful Motive to Imitation, a shorter and readier way of teaching our Duty, and inviting to it, as (a) *Seneca* has noted long ago; and many times prove of greater and more expeditious Influence than Precepts, as (b) a great Man has shewn since. And such illustrious Examples as these, if duly attended to, will naturally be spurring on to some like noble Atchievement. *Plutarch* has left it upon record concerning the valiant *Themistocles*, (c) that he could not sleep for thinking of *Miltiades's* mighty Victory over the *Persians*; and of *Theseus*, that (d) *Hercules's* famous Exploits would neither suffer him to be at ease Night nor Day, because himself had done nothing like them. Such an Emulation had these unusual Examples raised in their generous Minds. And is it not incomparably more rational for all true Christians,

to

(a) *Longum est iter per præcepta, breve & efficax per exempla.* Epist. 6. (b) *Dr. Barrow*, vol. 3. Sermon. 2. p. 17.

(c) *In vita Thesei.* (d) *Ibid.*

to have their Affections enflamed at the remembrance of these Heroick Champions for the Faith, awakening our drowsy Souls, stimulating our sluggishness, and pressing to a like Submission under all our Trials? A Consideration, not only of what they suffered, but also of their manner of Suffering it without Resistance, is of admirable Force, for recommending to all serious Christians an unwearied Imitation of such their Passive, and truly Christian Deportment.

But not only their Example is to be attended to in this Case, but it is of great use to reflect, that Non-resistance was the general Doctrine of all Christians, through all the best Ages of the Church. When Religion was in its Prime, and People were most strictly observant of their Duty in all respects, then this Doctrine was universally received, and none that bare the Name of Christians pretended to think of an Exemption from it. And that the contrary has met with such Countenance and Encouragement since, is owing to the lamentable Degeneracy of Manners, and that insatiable Love of the World, which as the Apostle informs us, (a) *is Enmity with GOD*, and which has introduced too great plenty of other shameful Immoralities together with it. So long as Men were duly mindful of their Blessed Lord, and his Example and Commands, they could readily plead their own Loyalty, to their Persecutors, and challenge them to find out any amongst the Followers of Christ, that had ever had a hand in any Treason or Rebellion. Which shews beyond doubt, in what Sense the several Passages in Scripture, so often cited in favour of Obedience to Authority, were then understood; and by consequence, how they ought to be understood now, by all that profess to own the same Lord they did, and be guided by the same Principles they were guided by. For it is to be remembered, that these were not only Holy and Good Men, and whose great Aim was GOD'S Glory, and their own Salvation; and who were therefore least of any under the Power of sensual and secular Interests and

De-

Designs ; and so were like to be the fairest and most impartial Interpreters of Scripture ; but that they unanimously agreed against *Resistance of the Higher Powers* ; no one Instance being left us all this time, of any Christian that dared to appear in defence of it. And if such an universal Consent of such Men, in such Times, and for so long together, be not sufficient to assert the true Interpretation even of less clear Texts of Scripture, than these whereupon the Doctrin of Non-resistance is founded , and especially of such as are thus plain, it will be to no purpose to think of ever understanding *What the Will of the Lord is*, in relation to this or any other Christian Duty. And I must confess I cannot see, why an Argument drawn from the Doctrins and Practices of these first Ages, is not to all Intents and Purposes as good and valid against Mr. *H.* or any other Patrons of Resistance, as it is against either Papists or Dissenters in other Cases.

It is true, had we received a New Gospel, relaxing the Obligation of the former ; and allowing to take quite contrary Measures to what that prescribes, this would be no Argument against any of them. But whilst the contrary holds good, whilst we have the same Lord to obey, and the same Laws to be governed by, have had no New Revelation to teach us a different sort of Doctrin, but still profess to adhere to the Old, and to be under the same Rule with the Primitive Church ; that which they received from our Saviour and his Apostles, and we successively from them ; there remains no Excuse for those that both resolve and teach to act in contradiction to it. They must either condemn these former Professors of the Faith, for having avowed and practised this Doctrin, or themselves, for being so averse to it.

The sum is, that since not only the Scriptures, taken in their most natural and genuine Sence, plainly teach the Doctrin of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance, even to tyrannical and wicked Princes, Enemies to GOD and true Religion ; but the Universal Church of Christ practised accordingly for several Ages, there is nothing to excuse such in these latter Days,

Days, as pretend to *Walk by the same Rule* with them; the revealed Word of GOD contained in those Sacred Volumes, there is nothing I say to excuse such from the like submissive, meek and patient manner of Deportment. And if any instead of this, shall take upon them *to Resist the Higher Powers*, they have all the Reason in the World to expect that heavy *Damnation*, which the Apostle has so peremptorily denounced against those that do so.

And now what has Mr. H. to say to this? Truly very little to any purpose. He is desirous to shift off this Argument as well as he can, and employs all his force to this end; but so as can never give Satisfaction to an impartial and inquisitive Reader, especially if he has any sort of insight into the History of the Times I have been treating of. He would fain persuade the World, that this Argument is of small weight, and ought to have very little regard paid to it. He is willing to assent to the consentient Testimony of these Fathers, as he would to the Authority of an unblemished Historian; but he has no Deference for their Judgment, nor will yield them to have in any respect *known the Will of our Lord and his Apostles, better than We at this distance*. He also insinuates, as if *their Practice were not truly parallel to that Passive Obedience against which he had argued*; and again, that *the Principle on which this Practice was built, is not sufficient to prove the Expedience and Duty of such Passive Obedience*. Wherefore this Defence of his against so Powerful a Cloud of Witnesses, I come next to consider, and to prove the Weakness and Invalidity of it. But this will be the matter of the next Section.

S E C T. IV.

What Mr. H. has offered in Answer to this Argument, from the Doctrin and Practice of the Primitive Christians.

THIS is all that remains of the Second Chapter, and tho' it will require a somewhat larger Discussion than I expected, his Defence being branch'd out into many Particulars,

ticalars, yet I see nothing in all he offers but what is capable of an easy and fair Solution : As will soon appear upon an impartial Enquiry into his several Observations, and his Inferences from them, whereby to maintain his *Hypothesis* : Which I know not how solidly he imagines to be supported by them, but am well satisfied, they will all leave it in a tottering condition, upon a brief Survey of them. Thus therefore he begins.

I. (a) *This Argument is not at all conclusive; nor allowed to be so by the Protestant Writers, and greatest Advocates for the Church of England in many other cases.* This is easily said. But he is not pleased to tell us who are these *Protestant Writers*, and *Advocates for the Church of England*; and till he does I am not at all concerned about them, nor any way bound to admit that there are any such.

II. He allows (b) *the universal Testimony of the First Christians as to Matter of Fact, must be received.* A singular Favour, and a very gracious Condescension ! He is so kind, he will not give the Lye to the consentient Testimony of all the best and purest Christians in a Matter of Fact recorded by them, but will allow them to be at least as credible as common Heathen Historians, who must be believed too, where they seem to speak Truth. This is notably done. But then it follows, (c) *that their Judgment in any difficult Point, or any part of their Practice depending upon that Judgment, ought not to be any farther regarded, than as it is founded on the Reason of the thing itself, or the Declaration of Christ and his Apostles.* But the best of it is, others, Men of great Probity and Knowledge, have had, have, and will have a Regard to the Universal Practice of these admirable Patterns of Virtue and true Holiness, and to the Doctrines delivered by them, how highly soever Mr. H. and his Followers may despise them. He may slight them, if he pleases, as Foolish, and Inconsiderate, and Betrayers of the Liberties and Safety of Mankind; but he must not expect it will be thought Wisdom in him to

(a) *Measures of Submission*, p.133. (b) *Ibid.* (c) P.134.

to do so. *Vincentius Lirinensis's* (a) Rule will still prevail, after all Mr. H.'s Attempts to the contrary, *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*; that what has been held by all Christians, in all Places, and at all Times, and especially in the first and purest Ages of the Church, must be held sound Christianity. So long therefore as we can prove our Doctrine, as I hope I have fully done, to be agreeable to the holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the general Consent of the Ancients in all Times and Places, we may well depend upon it, as having a Substantial, Solid and Immoveable Foundation. And it is very suspicious that any Writer is sensible of the badness of his Cause, when he is tempted to throw aside such a Succession of the Piouslest, and Best, and most Unexceptionable Witnesses the World had ever known, for not being of his Side. Oh! but Mr. H. is willing to hearken to them, so far as their *Judgment* or *Practice* is built upon the Reason of the Thing itself, or on the Declarations of Christ and his Apostles. Which I take to mean that he will admit them to be worthy of some Regard, whilst they are of the same Opinion with himself, but he will not yield them to have understood their Duty in this respect any whit better than he does, or to have adhered more faithfully to it. And all he has to say for it is, that if a middle way can be found out between this and making them Infallible, he will promise to embrace it. Well then, for once I will try to find out that Middle Way, in hope he will honestly make good his Promise of closing in with it. And it is this: That he look upon the Church in its First and Purest Ages, as most worthy of our serious Imitation, in this as well as other respects, and believe its Members, as they had better Advantages for understanding aright the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, than we who live at so great a distance from them, being better acquainted with some particular Phrases then in use, some Customs familiar to them, and some traditionary Accounts, which may since have been either quite lost, or else so grossly

cor-

(a) Commonit. c. 3.

corrupted, as to stand us in no stead; let him thus look upon the Church in these Ages, as better qualified for a right Understanding of Scripture, than we at this distance, and their universal Consent, as the best Commentary upon it; and moreover, to have been much more intent upon putting in Practice what was thus taught them, than the Generality of those that call themselves Christians are now, as they certainly were, and I promise myself he will not deny it; let him but take this course, and I am apt to think he will see his way, *that Middle Way*, plain before him. At least he ought to admit, that a Doctrine in which they so universally agreed, and which they were so willing to reduce into Practice, when they were sure to pay dear for it, could not be so nice and *difficult a Point*, as he would have it apprehended to be. Because it is not easily imaginable, that they would have so unanimously concurred in it, and so generally have ventured their Honours, their Employments, their Estates, their Lives, and all that was dear to them here for it.

I have always thought a singular Reverence due, to the universal Consent of several Ages of such devout and holy Souls; and that tho' they were not beyond all Possibility of Error, yet their Exemplary Piety and Integrity, their Contempt of the World, and Heavenly-mindedness, their nearer Acquaintance with the Usages of the Times wherein the Scriptures were written, and the Language they were written in, the Traditions that they had received from the Apostles, and their Successors, and Disciples, and the greater Measures of the Holy Ghost they may justly be presumed to have had vouchsafed them, for enlightening their Understanding, as well as they had for (a) Prophecies and (b) Miracles, might deservedly have given them a Pre-
hemi-

(a) Παρεῖ γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ μέχρι νῦν περρηπὴ χάρισματὶ ἔστι.
Just. Mart. c. Tryph. p. 308. Πλὴν καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἵχνη ἔστι τοῦ
ἀγίου πνεύματος. Orig. c. Cels. l. 7. p. 337.

(b) Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀειδμόν εἰπεῖν τὸ χάρισματων, ὧν καὶ πάντες
τε

heminence, above such as fall short of them in all these respects. And till Mr. *H.* shall prove this to be an Error, I shall very hardly be persuaded that it is so. But then I must beg leave to tell him; that to convince me, or any one else of this, there will need some stronger Argument, than his bare Assertion, that *he is not the first who has said the contrary.* I am sure it must be a great Disadvantage to any Cause, if it once appear to be no otherwise defensible, than by rejecting all the first Ages of Christianity from the Apostle's time, and downwards for several Generations. Such a Cloud of incontestable Witnesses is not to be shaken off; it being impossible to conceive, that they should from the beginning have all thus unanimously agreed in a Principle that had no just Foundation, and was then so detrimental to their temporal Interest, and so directly opposite to the common Inclinations of Flesh and Blood. Such an irresistible Authority would necessarily have called for our Attention to it, though we had not so well understood the Grounds they went upon. But when we have farther all that Mr. *H.* requires as sufficiently satisfactory, both *the Reason of the Thing*, this Doctrine of Non-resistance being most exactly consonant to the Meek and Peaceable, the Passive and Obedient Temper of the Gospel, and *its being founded on the Declarations of our Lord and his Apostles*, if this be not a threefold Cord that is not to be broken, there can be no such thing. And since this is a *middle way* which makes them of great Authority, but yet not *Infallible*, I leave it with Mr. *H.* hoping he will not forget his Promise to embrace it.

But Mr. *H.* proceeds; and excepts to some of the Passages alledged against him, as not answering the End they are alledged for, which therefore come now to be considered.

K

I.

τῷ κόσμῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ θεῶ λαβῆσα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τῷ σαυρωθέντι ἐπὶ ποντοπιατῶν, ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὀφειλόμενῃ. Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 2. c. 57.
 Fiunt ergo etiam nunc multa miracula: eodem Deo faciente, per quos vult, & quomodo vult, qui & illa quæ legimus fecit.
 B. Augusta de civi Dei, l. 22. c. 8:

1. (a) *Some, he says, are such as only declare in general, that Subjection is due to those in Authority, without any express limitation; and others add, in all cases in which they are not under higher Obligations to Almighty God; and this does not contradict any thing he has said.* Now it is true, he has never said in general, that Subjection is not due to those in Authority. And yet I can by no means see how his Doctrine, and that of these Christian Apologists and other Writers can consist together; because they seem apparently to have a different meaning, even in these same Words to which they both subscribe. These taught Obedience and Subjection to wicked and tyrannical Princes, the Invaders of their Rights, and professed Enemies to their Religion, and to themselves upon that account; and this without any Restraint or Reservation, or in his own Words, *without any express Limitation.* And therefore when in general Terms they only recommend *Subjection to those in Authority*, this in all reasonable Construction must be understood, to imply all that they at other ^{times} declare themselves to mean by being subject. On the other hand, Mr. H. allows of Subjection, but in a very different degree from theirs, that is to say, so far only as he apprehends his Prince to give a due Attendance to the *End of his Institution*; adding withal, that when he *deflects from that*, it is the Subject's Duty to stand up for himself; and (b) *a Passive Non-resistance in this case would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* So that when he admits Subjection to be a Duty, this can be thought to intend no more, than that it is a Duty till it shall be judged a proper season for Resistance. But it will be very absurd to fix this Interpretation upon the looser Expressions of such, as both by their Words and Actions are well known to have condemned all Resistance, upon whatever account, and without any manner of Restriction. Yet this is all the Agreement that is betwixt Mr. H. and Them, when they both declare in general Forms of Speech, that Subjection

is due to those in Authority. So that this is a mere Sophism and Equivocation ; and I dare answer for Mr. *H.* that if he retain his old Principles, he will never declare *Subjection to be due to those in Authority*, in the sense that the Primitive Christians did.

Others, he says, *add, in all cases, in which they are not under higher Obligations to Almighty God.* In which also he pretends to agree with them. But if we enquire a little, we shall soon discover another Amphibology, and that he is no nearer agreeing with them in the true Sense of these Words, wherein they understood them, than he was in the former. For their meaning by a *higher Obligation to Almighty God*, was not as his is, an Obligation to defend the temporal Rights and Safety of the Community against their Violence, but an Obligation not to obey any Command of theirs that was sinful, either in its own Nature, or as forbidden by God. They had a stricter Tye to study the Welfare of their Souls, than to promote their secular Safety or Advantage, by any undue Compliances with the unlawful Commands of their Superiours. And here they made a stand, and would endure whatever was laid upon them, rather than sin against God to please their Earthly Sovereign ; which is the only Case that they except to. And will Mr. *H.* advise to all other Submission but this ? Will he admit that I may prefer the Salvation of my Soul before the Ease and Safety of the Body, or even of the Community whereto I appertain ; and that so I do but forbear transgressing God's Commands, I may pay all other Subjection to my lawful Governors, though both the Society and myself were to suffer by it ? If he will, our Controversy is brought to a fair issue. But if he will not, I must be forced to tell him, that it is not very fair to affirm *that this does not contradict any thing he has said* ; inasmuch as, if rightly understood, it manifestly contradicts the main Design of his Book, and all that he has said in it in favour of Resistance.

2. (a) *Some are such as only declare Princes to be second*

K 2

to

to God, less than God only, and the like. All which he can heartily subscribe to. But if he do, I much doubt he will subscribe against his own Doctrine. For if the Prince be *next to God*, and so have none above him but God alone; he will find it a difficult matter to maintain, that those who are under him are any way impowered to call him to account for his Misgovernment. Nor is the Case he puts here at all parallel. Which is, that *this can no more prove them to be in all cases irresistible, than it can prove it unlawful to resist any Person in his violent Attempts upon the Lives, or Fortunes of others, to say that he is second to the King, and distinguished by his Post from the rest of the Nation.* For the next Person to the King is but a Subject, and the Laws are open, and Redress to be had ordinarily in that way, against the Violence he offers to any of his Fellow-Subjects; and there is the King's Authority for it. But where those Laws are to be found, that should punish Kings in like manner, Mr. *H.* has not yet shewn, nor ever can shew, as he very well knows, and for this substantial Reason, Because there are none such in being, either in Scripture, or Statute, or Common Law. So that it is plain here is no parity in the Cases put by him.

Besides, May not Princes be exempt from Resistance, though their Seconds were not? This must necessarily be granted, unless Mr. *H.* will say, that because he holds that Kings, who are Seconds to God, may be resisted, therefore God to whom they are Seconds, may be resisted too.

3. (a) *Some Passages alledged declare that God gave the Empire to Wicked Princes, as well as to the Good; and the like.* And this Mr. *H.* will have to mean no more than a bare permissive Providence. So that according to him the Prince has no better Right to his Power, than the Highwayman has to every Purse he takes; inasmuch as he could not take it without God's Permission. And there is not a Deist or *Epicurean* in the Nation, but how great an Enemy soever to the Divine Providence, will
never-

nevertheless own as much as this comes to. Hereupon also another Absurdity would follow ; namely, That so it would be impossible to explain how *the Powers that be, are ordained of God* ; as I have (a) formerly observ'd.

But it is a sad Conclusion, says Mr. H. *to infer from hence, that he bore an active part in the bringing all the Roman Emperors into the Possession of their Power.* Be it as sad as Mr. H. will have it, yet since it is what was taught not only by other Christians, but by S. Paul in the Words now recited, it is such as Mr. H. and all that call themselves Christians ought undoubtedly to acquiesce in. For which reason I would beg of Mr. H. to take heed how he condemns it, because in so doing he certainly condemns the holy Scriptures that teach it in the first place, as well as the Fathers after them.

It follows, *And as wretched a Conclusion, to infer from such Expressions, that it is his Will they should be irresistible in their whole Exercise of this Power.* I am sorry Mr. H. should set so ill a Character upon a Conclusion that has nothing in it, but what I have fully proved to be plainly taught in Scripture. But it is easy to see how far some Mens Zeal for a Cause will carry them.

Again says Mr. H. *The very Power of doing the greatest Injuries to his Neighbours is of God, the Maker and Governor of all things.* But the Question is only, whether it be so of God as the Prince's Power and Authority is. Wherefore let me ask ; Has God any where declared, that there is no injurious Person but of him, and that he is his Ordinance ? Is every Soul commanded to be subject to the injurious Person ? And is *Damnation* threatened to all that Resist him ? If not, I am apt to think Mr. H. will find himself quite besides his Text.

Lastly, Mr. H. subjoins, *The Empire and Power of Foreign Princes are of God, nay their very Invasions upon their neighbouring Nations could not be without his Permission ;*

K 3

but

but doth he therefore require those neighbouring Nations passively to submit, and to use no Arms of Resistance? And the same Answer will serve for this. For though the Power of foreign Princes over their proper Subjects is from God, they have no Power given them by him over such as they have no relation to. And though their Invasions upon their neighbouring Nations could not be without his Permission, Mr. H. acknowledges he has no where required those neighbouring Nations passively to submit, and to use no Arms of Resistance. And this is a very good reason, why they are under no Obligation to such a Submission and Non-resistance. But it will by no means follow from hence that Subjects are not obliged to submit to, and may with a good Conscience resist their own Lawful Superiours, the Resisting of whom is expressly declared to be *Resisting God's Ordinance*, and the Punishment of it to be *Damnation*.

4. If there be any Passages in the Fathers, which in general Expressions cloath Princes with a Divine Authority, it cannot be supposed from hence, that it was their Design to signify by such Expressions, that Princes were accompanied, in every single Instance of their Government, with a Divine Authority. This Mr. H. (a) asserts, and offers these two Reasons for it. 1. Because this would give to Almighty God an active part in their Wickedness. 2. Because this would extend so far as to lay an Obligation upon themselves, to pay an active Obedience to all their Commands, which they often denied to be due to them, and frequently refused to pay. Both which Reasons (b) I have formerly answered; and have observed in relation to the former of them, that Almighty God is no way chargable with the Abuse of a Power given by him in order to a better End. Which Mr. H. must own to be true, unless he will lay upon God the load of all the Sins that ever were committed in the World, because committed by a Power derived from him, though designed for the Serving him, and keeping his Commandments. And in relation to the

(a) P. 136.

(b) Part I. P. 36, 37, & 44, 45, & 131, 132, 139, 140.

the other I have noted again and again, that God has set Bounds to our Active Obedience, by requiring to obey *himself rather than Man*, but has no where limited our Passive Submission, or said, *thus far shall ye suffer and no farther*.

5. There are other Passages alledged, which only relate it as a matter of Fact, in order to obtain the Favour of their Princes, that the Christians were never found to be in any Plots, or any Seditions raised against them, which is only a Proof, that in their Circumstances, they knew their Interest so well as not to concern themselves in the State-Parties then in being, and not to render themselves odious, and suspected to the Emperor then in Possession. But it is impossible to prove from hence, that it was their Opinion, that a People ought passively to submit themselves, to be ruined at the Will of their Prince. Whereto I return Answer in these following Particulars.

1. I grant that the Christians did urge this for themselves, to obtain the Favour of their Princes, who had great Cause, if they would have considered it, to be very fond of, and shew all the Encouragement that might be to such faithful loyal Subjects, who stuck to them against all Opposers, and quietly and patiently submitted to them, under all the hard Trials they met with from them; and whom neither hope of Deliverance on the one hand could invite, nor fear of Suffering on the other could terrify, out of their Duty to them. This was a Plea that they might reasonably expect, should recommend them to the Mercy and Kindness of their Princes, as being the faithfullest and best of all their Subjects. And no wonder therefore if they made use of it, as they had occasion.

2. But then I deny that Policy, and not Duty, was the cause of this Submission, as Mr. H. would insinuate. They knew very well the Doctrine of the Gospel in this respect, and how strictly they were bound to behave themselves according to it, and so became obedient out of a sense of Duty to God, and a serious Regard to another Life, and frequently appeal to the Principles of their Religion for their Vindication, declaring it a ne-

cessary part thereof, (a) to Honour, and Obey, and be Subject to the King *for the Lord's sake*, and out of Obedience to his Commands. And Mr. *H.* if he will reflect upon it, may easily be convinced how unkindly he deals by them, in resolving all those Sufferings, for which their Memory has been so worthily celebrated, and they have been had in such Honour and Veneration ever since, into mere Policy and Reason of State. Let a Man be ever so Serious and Religious, and ever so desirous to serve God to the utmost of his Power, his best Actions may however be shamefully tarnished at this rate. He may be supposed Sober only for his Health's sake or to save his Money; Honest only to preserve his Credit, Devout out of Vainglory and to be seen of Men; or whatever Virtues shine brightest in him may be said however to proceed, not from a true Principle of Religion in his Soul, but from some secular and unworthy Design. But does Mr. *H.* count this fair dealing? Or would he be willing to be used thus himself? If not, he would do well to make some Reparation to these truly Christian Worthies, on whom he has cast such an undeserved Reflection. Who were certainly of a very different Temper, and had quite other Aims and Designs from what he seems to intimate. *Their Conversation was in Heaven*; and their great Care was to lay up to themselves Treasures there, little minding what became of all their Worldly Concerns, or even of themselves in the mean time. They *had respect to the Recompence of Reward*, that inestimable Crown of Glory, which easily enabled them (b) to wade even through Seas of Blood to get at it. They

counted

(a) Λέγει ὁ νόμος τῷ θεῷ· πῶς ὑὸς θεοῦ καὶ βασιλεῖα, καὶ μηδενὶ αὐτῶν ἀπειθῆς ἦς. Theoph. Ant. ad Autol. l. i. p. 77. Et Apostolus Paulus hoc ipsum ait; Omnibus potestatibus sublimioribus subiecti estote; non est enim potestas nisi à Deo. Iren. adv. hæres. l. 5. c. 24. Μὴ ποτε δίκαιον εἶναι διδασκῶν τὸ κατ' ἀνδρώπῃς πόλιν καὶ τῷ ἐαυτῷ μαθητῶν, καὶ ἀδικῶτατος ἐκεῖνος ἢ. Orig. c. Cell. l. 3. p. 115.

(b) Ἐγὼ οὐ μαχάριζας, ἐγὼ οὐ θεῶ· μετὰ δὲ θνείων, μετὰ δὲ θεῶ.

counted (c) not their Lives dear to them, that they might finish their Course with Joy, and attain to the Resurrection of the Just, and be for ever happy in the Kingdom of Heaven. So little were they afraid of the cruellest Deaths, (d) and had such a fondness for this sort of departure out of the World, that they were really under no Temptation to save themselves by Resistance, if they could have been sure to do it. And accordingly encouraged each other (e) to proceed resolutely in their Patience and Constancy to the Death, always keeping in

δεῦ. B. Ignat. ep. ad Smyrn. Ταύτη ἄρα τὸς πόνους, καὶ τὰς βασάνους, καὶ θλίψεις, ἔχ' ὡς παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσφοῖς οἱ ἄνδρες, ἐλπίδι τῆς πυύσουσας μὲν τὰ ἐνεσῶντα ἀλλογενῆ, αὐθις ἢ τῶν ἡθῶν μεταστρεῖν, ὑπομῖναι [ὁ γνῶστος] ἀλλ' ἢ γνῶσις αὐτῶν πείσμα βέβαιον ἐνεργῆναι τὸ ἅμ' μαλλόντων ἐλπίδων ἀπολήψεως. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 7. Qui se excrucianos, & excarnificandos pro Evangelio furentibus tradidissent, ne Martyrii honorem merito perderent. B. Cypr. epist. 30. Famem vincitis, & sitim spernitis, & squalorem carceris, ac receptaculi pœnalis horrorem roboris vigore calcatis. Pœna illic subigitur, cruciatus obteritur, nec mors metuitur, sed optatur, quæ scilicet immortalitatis præmio vincitur, ut vitæ æternitate qui vicerit coronetur. Id ep. 37. Carcer Christicolis gradus coronæ est. Prudent. Hymn. 6. Μείζονα πλῆστον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡγνῆται τὸ τῆ βίης δόξης καὶ τρυφῆς, τὸς ὑπὲρ ὁσιβείας ὀνειδισμῶς τε καὶ πόνους, καὶ τὸς κακὰν ἐργασίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πολυτρόπως θανάτους &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 8. c. 6.

(c) Spernunt tormenta præsentia --- & dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent. Cecil. in Min. Fel. Θανατέμφοι χαίρομεν. πρῶτοντες ἐπ' ἀνασῆσαι ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς χριστοῦ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀφθάρτους, καὶ ἀπαθείς, καὶ ἀθανάτους ποιήσει. Just. M. c. Tryph.

(d) Αὐτῶν τελείωσιν τὸ μαρτυρεῖν καλῶς, ἔχ' ἐπ' τέλος τῆς βίης ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔλαβεν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' αἰετῶς τελειὸν ἔργον ἀγάπης ἐνδείξασθαι. Clem. Alex. Stro. l. 4. Θανατῶς μᾶλλον αἰδέμεθα, καὶ ὑπομῖναι, πεπεισμένοι ἐπὶ πάνθ' ἔσθαι ὑπέχνηται ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς χριστοῦ ἀγάδης, ἀποδώσει ἡμῖν. Just. Mart. c. Tryph.

(e) Bonum agonem subituri estis, in quo Agonothetes Deus vivus est, Xystarches spiritus sanctus, corona æternitatis brabium, angelicæ substantiæ politeia in cœlis, gloria in secula seculorum. Tertull. ad Martyras. c. 3.

in mind that (f) their Loss of this World and all they enjoyed in it, together with all the Troubles and Sorrows that befel them, were in no wise to be compared with that unconceivable Felicity which they had continually in their Eye, and wherein they were shortly to be instated.

And what an intolerable Affront is it to them, now at length after so many Ages of Fame and Glory, to represent them as a company of mere Pretenders, who gave out that Non-resistance was a known part of their Religion, when in truth they believed nothing of it, and all their Submission was owing to worldly Policy, and a desire to live easily here at present? This is such a Disgrace cast upon those Blessed Saints and Martyrs, now reigning triumphantly in Heaven, as would put a Man almost beyond all Patience. But I am resolved to say no more of it, but leave Mr. *H.* to ruminate upon it, and weigh with himself, whether he has done Justice to this Glorious Army of Martyrs and Confessors, in fixing so groundless and undeserved a Charge upon them.

3. It is impossible to put any fair Construction upon their Sufferings, together with the Professions they made of Duty and Submission to their Sovereigns, that will not shew them to have thought it necessarily incumbent upon them, to bear all sorts of Indignities and Torments, rather than *Resist the Higher Powers*. The Character of the Persons, and the unblemished Sincerity and Integrity they shewed in all their other Actions, challenges a belief of whatever they pleaded for themselves in this respect. But their Admonitions and Exhortations to this purpose are more express, teaching (g) to *Reverence and Honour the Emperor, as one chosen by God, and desire and pray for his Welfare, to study to be quiet, and raise no Tumults or Commotions among their Fellow-Subjects,*

(f) Οἱ καὶ ὁμοίως ἐχώρουν αὐτοῖς, πᾶν εἶδος ὀνειδισμοῦ καὶ κολάσεως ἀνεχόμενοι· οἱ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὀλίγα ἡγούμενοι ὑποτάσσοντες πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον· ὥτως ὁπιδεικνύμενοι ὅτι ἐκ ἀξίας τὰ παθήματα τῶ νυν καὶ πρὸς τινὲς μέλλουσιν δοῦναι ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς, &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.

(g) See Sect. 2, & 3.

Subjects, to continue faithful to Almighty God, and for his sake to such as are put in Authority under him; together with their publick Declarations and solemn Professions, that they would not Resist such as set upon them, not accounting it lawful to kill those that hurt them; that they looked upon Religion as what was to be defended, not by Fighting, but by Dying for it; not by Wickedness, but by a sure Trust in God; that these Words, *he that Resisteth the Power, Resisteth the Ordinance of God*, are levelled against such as trust to their own Strength, thinking themselves out of danger of being called to account for it, that they might not seek to maintain their Ground by Resistance, and that David being a King had none to fear but God, with other like Expressions. And does Mr. H. think all these no Proof that they were in earnest, and really meant that their Principles would not allow them to resist their Sovereign? Let him call to mind also their Praying and Entreating the Emperor, but not pretending to Fight with him, their challenging the Enemy to prove any amongst them guilty of Sedition, their patient Submission to the most outrageous ill Usage, and the cruellest and worst of Deaths, and that great Numbers of them suffered thus at a time, and when in all appearance abundantly able to have defended themselves against their Assailants, if their Religion would have admitted of it; and particularly their submissive Behaviour towards the Apostate Julian, and especially in his Expedition against Persia; but above all, the Testimony this their subtle Enemy bare to them, that they no sooner discovered the Authors of any Disturbance in the Empire, but they readily did their part to bring them to condign Punishment; let him revolve these things in his Mind, and then let him try if he can suffer himself to persist in this Persuasion, that it is impossible to prove from hence, that it was their Opinion, that a People ought passively to submit, to be ruined at the Will of the Prince, or in other Terms, That they ought to venture the Loss of all in this World, much rather than incur the dreadful Guilt of Resisting God's Ordinance, and thereby expose themselves to eternal Misery in the other. There is no Compare betwixt these two. And these
Christian

Christian Heroes were so wise, as to *choose that better part which shall not be taken from them*. And having done so, it is just matter of Complaint, that Mr. H. should represent them as Men of this World, and whose chief Concern was the Safety and Happiness of Human Society, rather than the Service and Honour of God, and the eternal Salvation of their own Souls. But it seems he knew not how otherwise to maintain his own Hypothesis, which is especially to be taken care of, whatever the consequence be. And so much concerning his fifth Exception.

6. *As for the Christians not so much as wishing in any circumstances, for a new Emperor, it is so very hard to believe, that it may rather seem a strain of Oratory in Tertullian, than a Sentence to be literally understood of the whole Body of the Christians.* And if this were admitted, there is Evidence enough to do the Business without it. But however, Mr. H. has given good Reason why, at that time at least, this might have been strictly and literally spoken, if what he says be true, that (a) *it was of small importance to the Christians, what Persons were at the Head of Affairs, so equally were they hated by all, and so universally were they abused, and misrepresented to the great Men of this World.* For it was to no purpose for them to wish for a Change, if they knew beforehand, that they were to expect no Benefit by it, as Mr. H. here supposes.

But now if this Wish were intended, only in order to receive fresh Bounties, as was usual upon the Inauguration of a new *Cæsar*, which Mr. H. may easily see is the true meaning of the Expression, then there is not the least shadow of a Reason for imagining, the Christians to have been, or that they could be guilty of so mean a Thought; it being unconceivable, that such a Desire could enter into the Minds of Persons so much above this World and all its Temptations; and who therefore could never suffer such poor trifling Advantages to incline them any way to favour or desire a Change upon so slight an Account.

This

This I take to be *Tertullian's* Meaning in this place; and I am confident Mr. *H.* when he has better considered it, must own it to be so. And if this be once admitted, it will not be so *very hard to believe*, that this is no *Strain of Oratory*, but a *Sentence to be Literally understood of the whole Body of Christians.*

And yet once more, if by *not Wishing for a new Emperor*, had been meant that they did not Wish to have even their Persecuting Emperors taken away by any indirect and unlawful Means; and that they were rather for referring their Cause to God, than seeking to right themselves against such tyrannical Superiours, I can see nothing in this but what might very well become the Temper and Genius of the Gospel, and all such Professors of it, as believed it utterly unlawful; and a heinous Crime in any case, to *lift up their Hand against the Lord's Anointed.* And accordingly we read how often, and how earnestly they prayed for the Safety and Prosperity of the Emperor and his Posterity, as well as for themselves, and the rest of the Empire. Which was not like Men that thought themselves authorised, to take up Arms against them, and Depose, and Kill them, rather than permit *themselves to be ruined*, as to their Temporal Concerns, *at their Will and Pleasure.*

But the former seems rather to be the Sence intended by *Tertullian*, as appears from the preceding Words, wherein he upbraids the Heathens, that could their Breasts be seen into, (a) *there would presently appear a very odd Scene of New Cæsars one after another, dividing their Doles amongst the Crowd.* So also *Franciscus Zephyrus* paraphrases on the Words, (b) *For the People here mind their Cæsar, only so long as they reap the Fruits of his*

(a) Cujus non præcordia insculpta apparent novi ac novi Cæsaris Scenam in congiario dividundo præidentis? etiam illa horâ quâ acclamant, *De nostris annis tibi Jupiter augeat annos.*

(b) Tantisper enim observat Cæsarem Plebs, quamdiu utilis est, omnisq; illa adulatio à commodis extorquetur, non à verâ proficiscitur observantiâ.

his Bounty, and all their Flattery proceeds merely from his Gifts, not from a hearty Reverence for him. And what Mr. H. can see in such a Wish as this, so ill grounded, and to so mean an end, that the Christians might not literally disclaim all Thoughts of it, I am yet to learn. Especially if it be remembred how heartily they both taught to Pray, and Prayed for their Persecuting Emperors, as I have fully shewn. For I can hardly suspect Mr. H. will pretend, that such their Professions and Prayers were not to be understood *Literally*, and as the Words most naturally import.

7. Some other Passages, and those of a late date, only declare, that a Christian Bishop did not think Arms of Resistance so proper for his Character, as Prayers and Tears; which might as well be said with respect to a foreign Enemy, as to his own Prince: For St. Ambrose, in the famous Place so often cited for the Purpose of Passive Obedience, saith in so many Words, Bishops have no other Defence; confining what he saith to his own sacred Order. Here Mr. H. pretends to answer all the Passages cited in behalf of Prayers and Tears, as the only Arms of Christians against their Sovereign. And tho' he speaks of Passages in the Plural, yet that he may the more easily triumph over them, he shrinks them all into one. For, says he, St. Ambrose, in the famous Place so often cited for the Purpose of Passive Obedience, saith in so many Words, Bishops have no other Defence. Where this famous Place of St. Ambrose is, he does not vouchsafe to tell us; and therefore I must acquaint such Readers as do not know it already, that it is in his fifth Tome, and his first Sermon, *Pro variis actionibus*, entituled, *De Basilicis non tradendis -- contra Auxentium Invasorem*: and his Words are these: *Adversus arma, milites, Gothos quoque, lachryme mea arma sunt; talia enim munimenta sunt sacerdotis.* Against Arms, Soldiers, and even the Goths, my Tears are my Weapons; for these are a Priest's best Defence. But is this one all the Passages Mr. H. undertakes to answer? If he knows of others that he has said nothing to,

to; it was not so fairly done, to impose upon the Reader, as if he had answered all. But if he does not know of others, I shall beg leave to present him with some of them. Thus therefore says S. Cyprian to *Cornelius*, and not so late as from Mr. H. might be suspected; (a) *Let us diligently employ our selves in continual Groans, and reiterated Prayers, for these sunt nobis arma coelestia, are not our Sacerdotal, as St. Ambrose speaks, but our Heavenly Weapons, which enable us to stand and persevere courageously; these are our Spiritual Arms, and the Divine Darts that protect us.* It is true, he writes this to a Fellow-Bishop, but here is nothing in what he writes, but might besit any other Christians, as well as Bishops. And so I see not by what Logick Mr. H. can hope to appropriate this only to the *Sacred Order*. But *Gregory Nazianzen* is fuller to the Purpose, (b) when speaking of *Julian's* excessive Enmity to the Christians, he adds, *But he was stopp'd in his career, by the Favour of God, and the Tears of the Christians, not of the Bishops, or Priests only, but of the Christians in general, that were plentifully shed by many of them;* τὰ το μόνον ἔχοντων καὶ τὰ δάκρυα φάσιν μακρόν· this being the only Remedy they had against the Persecutor. Agreeably whereto, at another time, having mentioned the good Success of *Hezekiah's* Prayer against *Sennacherib*, he professed much to the same purpose, that the Christians (c) only Armour, and Wall of Defence, and all the Fortres they had left them, was their Hope in God; so that being destitute of all humane help or assistance, they had none to hear their Prayers, or defeat the Threatnings of their Persecutors, but him that (d) swears against the Pride of Jacob. Non quod non possent, sed quod nolent, &c. says Bishop *Montague*, in his Notes upon the Place; Not because they could not, but because they would not. For they had Force enough to restrain the Tyrant, as St. *Augustin* teaches, and our Author shews, when he declares the Christian Religion to be so widely diffused, and to have taken such deep Rooting; as that it seems in no danger

(a) Epist. 60.

(b) ΣΤΗΛΙΤΑΤ. α'. p. 57.

(c) ΣΤΗΛ. ε'. p. 100.

(d) Amos. 6. 8.

danger of being extirpated, without the Empire's falling together with it. But they had learned Patience in the School of Christ, as being recommended to them both by his Doctrine, and by his Example, not to put all things into Combustion, as too many since have been apt to do. So likewise says St. Chrysostom, to his Flock at Constantino-ple; (d) Let us fall on our knees to the King, or rather let us beseech our most gracious God, to mitigate the King's Rage, and soften his Heart, and incline him to favour and pity us. Mr. H. perhaps may look upon this as a very wrong method, and a dangerous course, and that the good Bishop ought to have had more regard to the Welfare of the Society; and that he would have done much better to excite the People to Arms, rather than Prayers. But I cannot help that. S. Chrysostom it seems was another sort of Christian, and a Friend to Passive Obedience, and was of opinion that Prayers to God, and Intreaties to the King, were better becoming the Professors of the Gospel, and like to turn to better Account with them. But to return to S. Ambrose, I may appeal even to him against Mr. H. who commends his People of Milan in such a manner, for Praying and Beseeching the Emperor, as makes it manifest, he accounted of Prayers and Tears not as the Arms of the Clergy only, tho' theirs more peculiarly, but as well suiting with other Christians also. His Words are these: (e) What could be said better by Christian Men, than what the Holy Ghost has spoken to day in you? Rogamus Auguste, non pugnamus; non timemus, sed rogamus: We beseech thee O Emperor, we do not fight against thee; We are not so affrighted, but that we still beseech thee: (f) This was to act like Christians, to seek both Peace and Faith; but neither of them at the Loss, or by a Breach of the other. They would not suffer themselves to be scared out of their Allegiance, or to fly to any other Course, but Suppli-

(d) Εἰς τὸν Εὐαγγελ. ὕμνον. To. 8. p. 70.

(e) Epist. l. 2. ep. 14.

(f) Hoc Christianos decet, ut & tranquillitas pacis optetur & fidei, veritatisq; constantia nec mortis revocetur periculo.

tations and Intreaties; and this *S. Ambrose* commends, as what well became the Followers of the Meek and Blessed *Jesus*. Whence it is evident *S. Ambrose* thought the Prayers of the People entreating the Emperor, no less proper Arms for them; than those the Bishops and Priests offered up to God were for them. But what I insist upon as most material in this Passage, is his declaring so expressly against Fighting with the Emperor; which it could not be expected he would have done, if he had had as little regard for the Doctrine of Nonresistance, as *Mr. H.* So that after all, we have the Testimony of this *S. Ambrose*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *S. Chrysostom* in the Fourth Century, and *S. Cyprian* in the Third, in favour of this exploded Prescription of *Prayers and Tears*, as much more agreeable to the Christian Institution, than *Arms of Resistance* against our Sovereign. Which, if duly considered, may, I hope, help *Mr. H.* to form a right Judgment in this matter.

8. (g) The two Principal Testimonies concerning the the Practice and Principles of the Primitive Christians, and those on which the main stress is laid by the best of Writers in Favour of Passive Obedience, are the Accounts given by *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian*. What is said to be affirmed by these two Primitive Writers amounts to this; That the Christians were barbarously used by the Emperors, and those who acted under them; that they were very numerous, and able to defend themselves against the violent Invasion of their Rights and Lives; but notwithstanding this, that they never resisted their Superiors, or by Force guarded themselves against their unjust Persecutions. And from hence it is concluded by *SOME*, that Resistance to Princes, is in all cases unlawful. Now I have shewn the truth of this from *Eusebius*, and the other Historians, from *Lactantius*, *S. Augustine* and others, particularly from these two here named, and from *Pliny* and *Julian* amongst the Heathens; all whom *Mr. H.* has taken no notice of, as if *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian* had been all the Witnesses that could be produced in this Matter. Whereas there is

L very

very good Evidence, and such as is by no means to be got over, if these two instances in, were wholly set aside. So that it is plain the Method he has taken is wrong, and would not *help us to form a right Judgment in this Matter*, even tho' all he desires about it were granted him. But there is no reason for such a grant; for not only these two eminent Writers are not to be got over, as he pretends, but their Testimony is well corroborated by the concurrent Suffrage of others, both Friends and Enemies: Which is as much as those *SOME*, who hence conclude the Unlawfulness of Resistance, can possibly desire. However, Mr. H. has a few Observations to offer, which must not be passed by.

I. The First is, that (a) *Tertullian, in the very same places, in which he gives this account of the Behaviour of the Christians in his time, under Persecution, gives likewise such an account of their Behaviour, in many other respects, as is allowed by the Patrons of Passive Obedience to be such as other Christians are not obliged to imitate, and in some cases such as cannot be justified.* Now admit this to be so as here objected, yet in the first place, this Objection concerns *Tertullian* only, and so *S. Cyprian's* Testimony might be of force notwithstanding any thing here offered; and in the next place this will by no means prove, that the several Passages referred to in *Tertullian*, do not testify the Christians strong enough to have defended themselves against the Forces of the Empire, if they had been at liberty to try their Strength. This I say upon supposition of *Tertullian's* having in many other respects represented the Christians Behaviour to be such as other Christians are not obliged to imitate. But now if a Man should ask, what are these many Failures of the Primitive Christians, which are not to be imitated, Mr. H. instances particularly in one only, that *They ran unnecessarily to Torments.* And it is true, sometimes they did so. But this was so far from being a constant, unanimous, and universal Practice amongst them, that some of them expressly declare against bringing these Evils

Evils needlessly upon themselves. As particularly; Origen professes (a) against Celsus, Οὐ μὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς, ὡς οὐκ ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἑαυτῶν, &c. We are not so mad, as needlessly to provoke the Anger of the King or Potentate against ourselves, and so wilfully expose ourselves, to Stripes, or Tortures, or Deaths. And (b) Polycarp before him, Οὐκ ἐπαίνεῖται τὰς πεποιθότας ἑαυτοῖς, &c. or as the learned Dr. Smith conjectures, πεποιθότας ἑαυτοῖς, We do not think those to be commended who offer themselves of their own accord, but those, as the Latin Translation adds, who being unwillingly discovered are not afraid of suffering. This, says he, is all that the Gospel requires. And when it was grown too common, Canons were thought necessary to be made against it, to prevent the like for the future. And till Mr. H. can shew the like Prohibitions of Non-resistance, I hope he will not insist upon these as parallel Instances; nor desire that they should be thought to have had a like universal Consent of all Christians. Yet till this be made out, which never can be, the overforward Zeal of some in the one case, will be no excuse for the disloyal and unchristian Liberty taken by any in the other.

2. It is likewise objected, that neither Tertullian nor S. Cyprian say any thing, from which it may certainly be concluded, that the number of Christians was great enough, to be a match for the regulated Forces of their Emperors, and the rest of their Fellow-Subjects. Mr. H. then, I must conclude, has found out a new way of rendering these Words of Tertullian, (c) Cui bello non Idonei? non Prompti fuisset? In one Night's space, says the Father, by the help only of a few Torches, we could revenge ourselves to the full, if it were lawful for us to repay one Wrong for another. But God forbid that this Divine Sect should seek thus (d) to set all on fire, as others perhaps in like circumstances would have done, by way of Retaliation for the many Injuries received, or should refuse to suffer what is sent to try them. Nay farther, would we but act as open Enemies, not as private

L 2

Conspi-

(a) L. 8. p. 20.

(b) De Polycarpi Martyrio. c. 4.

(c) Apol. c. 37.

(d) Absit ut igni humano vindicetur Divina Secta.

Conspirators, could we want Forces and Troops? Do ye reckon the Moors and Marcomans, the Parthians, and the People of any of those Nations you have lately conquered, who are confined to the Bounds of their single Country, to be more than the Christians who are spread over the face of all the Earth? (a) We are but of yesterday, and yet have already filled all places amongst you, your Cities, Isles, Castles, Corporations, Councils, Camps, Wards, Companies, the Senate, the Forum, leaving nothing void of us but the Temples, which we desire to have nothing to do with. And now for what War are we not sufficient and in readiness? Especially considering that, though we were fewer in Number than we really are, yet the Usage we have met with, has disarmed Death of all its Terror, and disposed us willingly to meet it; unless our Religion had taught us rather to be killed, than kill. Here *Tertullian* not only positively declares the Christians in a good condition for making War upon their Emperors; that they could not only have done them irreparable Damage, by clandestine unforeseen Devices, but were able to bear up against them in the open Field; especially remembring how desperate the Cruelties they underwent might be supposed to have made them, and that such, who value not their own Lives may easily be Masters of others. What then could make them so quiet and contented in such uncomfortable Circumstances? This he tells us in the next Words. They were under the restraint of their Religion, which had taught them to submit, though to the Death, rather than take away the Lives even of their hottest Persecutors. And after all is this no Proof, that they were numerous enough to have vindicated themselves, if they had thought Resistance lawful? It seems it is not with Mr. H. Nor do I know what Words would satisfy him, that the State of the Case was really and truly, as *Tertullian* represents it. But this one would think were enough, to persuade any unbyassed Person, that the Christians had sufficient Temptation to Resist, and were sufficiently enabled

Hesterni sumus.

(a) So I read it with Rigaltius; though Zephyrus and Pamelius have it; *Externi sumus.*

enabled for it, if a sense of their Duty had not withheld them from it.

Thus Mr. H. contradicts the plain positive Evidence of *Tertullian*. As to S. Cyprian he tells us, (a) *All that can be gathered from what he says, is, that in those Parts he speaks of, he thought the Christians were numerous enough, to rescue one another out of the Hands of their Persecutors, and to revenge themselves upon them.* And who but Mr. H. would not take this for a sufficient Proof, of their Ability to Resist their merciless Governors, in order to such a Rescue? If they were *numerous enough* to make head against their Persecutors, as Mr. H. allows, this is all I desire of him. And after such a Concession Mr. H. may flourish with his Eloquence, and make S. Cyprian write as like a Poet as *Tertullian*. Yet at last he must be forced to acknowledge, that they both made these Boasts, to such as may well be conceived the most competent Judges that could be of the Truth of what they affirmed, and who in all probability would have convinced them to their cost, of the falshood of their Plea, if they had not known it true. And this same S. Cyprian assigns another cause of their Patience and Submission, that it proceeded not from their Inability to stand upon their own Defence, but their Trust in God to take care of them, and a Resolution consequent hereupon, to leave all Vengeance to God, to whom it properly belongs. He exhorts *Demetrian* (b) to leave off persecuting the *Servants of God and Christ*, quos ultio divina defendit, whom the Divine Vengeance protects. Hence therefore he professes, *None of us when seized makes any Resistance, or sets himself to be even with you for your unjust Violence; though you see our Multitudes and Strength.* It was somewhat surprizing, that Mr. H. should take S. Cyprian for so weak an Advocate, as to provoke the Magistrate by the noise of such false Musters, as were the likeliest means he could pitch upon to put their Enemies upon those Cruelties he was endeavouring to stave off.

L 3

However

(a) Ibid.

(b) Ad Demetrian. p. 192.

However still (a) Mr. H. is not satisfied that the Christians were in a condition to make a defensive War against the Emperor's Armies. Yet be he as incredulous as he pleases, I cannot but think these two Fathers to have understood their own case, better than he can pretend to do, and since they speak so plain, I hope it will be no fault for others to believe them, whether Mr. H. do or no.

But Mr. H. excepts to *Tertullian's* Evidence from another Saying of his. For, says he in another place, *the utmost he can permit himself to say of Christians, is that they were* (b) *pars pene major Civitatis cujusq; almost the greatest part of every City.* Now what if he did say so? Is this any Contradiction to what either himself or *S. Cyprian* says? Is it not rather a Confirmation of it? *S. Cyprian* tells how Numerous and Strong they were; and *Tertullian* says they had filled all Places and Parts of the Empire, and now he adds they were not only dispersed through all their Cities, but there was hardly a City of which they were not the greater part. And is this a Proof that they wanted Numbers? I doubt Mr. H. talks here more like a Poet than *Tertullian*, who plainly enough asserts their great Power and Strength. So that I may very well put his own Question before mentioned, *For what War were they not fit and ready?* Especially considering how their Persecutors might have provoked them; and again that had a War been once begun, no one now knows what Assistance they might reasonably have promised themselves, from others who were far enough from being Christians, but yet sometimes were partakers with them in the Wrongs they suffered, and so might have Ends of their own to serve by a Revolution, either to deliver them from some Pressure they groaned under, or to take their Revenge upon such as had tyrannized over them, or to fish in troubled Waters, and try if they could make their Fortunes out of the Publick Wreck. And which was of much greater weight than all these Considerations put toge-

(a) P. 140.

(b) Ad Scap. c. 2.

together, if they had been acquainted with Mr. H.'s discovery not only of the Lawfulness of Resistance, but that it was a Christian Duty, and well-pleasing to Almighty God, they might have expected his Providence to assist and defend them, and fight abundantly more successfully for them against their Enemies, than all their own Forces and Arms, or whatsoever Human Means.

Mr. H. adds, *The same might be said of the French Protestants; and yet considering all things, it doth not appear that they could pretend to be an equal Match for their King, and all his Armies and Adherents.* And who ever said they were? It is true they were a very considerable Body, and made up a good part of the Kingdom, as every one knows, that knows any thing of them; but yet they were at most, as I am well informed, not a tenth part of the Whole. Nor did any of them ever presume to talk to their Governors, as these Christians did to theirs. If they had, they would soon have found to their cost, that they were not in a condition to support themselves against the rest, and so might have hastened those Calamities upon themselves, which they have since felt. From whence every one may see, how far these Cases are from being parallel, inasmuch as the Numbers of these latter seem by no means to bear proportion to those of the former. Neither did they ever pretend to insist upon any such Plea before their Governors, as the others freely did, and with such Confidence as must have turned to their exceeding Disadvantage, if what they said had not been true.

3. Mr. H. undertakes to enquire into the *Reasons on which this Behaviour of the Christians was founded; and urges (a) that we do not find that these Writers do in any of the Passages cited from them, ever so much as intimate that their Persecutors had the least degree of Divine Authority, in their unjust Proceedings against them, or that they ever fixed their Obligation to that Passive Obedience which they exercised, upon the Divine Right of their Emperors.*

L. 4

But

But did they not teach to Submit, and not Resist their Persecuting Emperors, and this for God's sake, and out of Obedience to the Laws of the Gospel? They were under no necessity to use only just those Expressions Mr. H. would have put into their Mouths, whilst they had others that very well answered their Design. If they pleaded to their Governors that they were their best Subjects, and durst not be otherwise, this was enough to let us see, what their Notion of Resistance was, though they might not think fit to quote the Words of Scripture to those who knew nothing of them. Which Mr. H. if he pleases, may take notice of in a particular manner. Both Tertullian and S. Cyprian both taught Passive Obedience, and put it in practice under their greatest Trials and Oppression; and it is a hard case if this be not enough to shew what their Opinion was of it. And if they or either of them judged it properest, in their Pleas for themselves, for Reasons they have not thought it necessary to acquaint us with, to insist rather upon the general Doctrines of an universal Love and Kindness, than upon the more express Prohibitions of Resistance that are to be found in Scripture, this will never prove that that Non-resistance which they taught both by their Doctrines and their Lives, was not then, or is not now a necessary part of our Religion. We do not find, says Mr. H. that they alledge the celebrated Passage of S. Paul, Rom. 13. 1, &c. to shew the Obligation they were under to Non-resistance, and this he thinks ought to be taken notice of in a particular manner. But why I pray? Was it not sufficient? Indeed was it not far better, to put those they spake, or wrote to, in mind of the wonderful Influence their Religion had upon them, to make them patient and submissive, quiet and obedient in all Cases, never presuming, upon whatever Provocation, to resist Themselves, or disturb their Government, or encourage any else to do it? When their Governors saw them thus universally compliant, choosing rather to suffer to the utmost, than try to rescue themselves by any manner of Force, this would be an ocular Demonstration of their immovable adherence to the Precepts of their

their Religion. And to put these Governors in mind of such their truly Christian Behaviour, was a more likely way to ingratiate themselves with them, than quoting the Apostle's Words to those, who had no regard for Scripture, could be. And if these Writers made choice of the wiser and better method of vindicating themselves, Mr. H. may take notice of it as much as he pleases; but he will never be able to prove from hence, that the Apostle's Doctrine was not a Rule to them, how to behave themselves in relation to the Higher Powers, and that their Non-resistance did not proceed from this, and other Passages to the same effect in Scripture.

But here Mr. H. has made a strange Discovery, of (a) *something truly, which one would hardly believe, and yet may be inferred from these Testimonies.* Well, I am always desirous to be informed; and let us see therefore what this strange Inference is, that is so lately come to light. It is no other than this, *That the Christians of those Days founded their Non-resistance upon such Principles, and such Interpretations, as did in effect take away from themselves the liberty of Self-defence, in all possible Cases.* I confess it would have been very surprizing, and very wonderful, if he could have discovered, that they had set up for the Doctrine of Resistance, as he does. But this he could not pretend. Their being of a contrary Persuasion was so flagrant a Truth, that it was not to be denied; and so he is necessitated to own they had Principles of Non-resistance. Only he is of opinion that these Principles were such, *as did in effect take away the liberty of Self-defence in all Cases.* What he finds in S. Cyprian to ground this Assertion upon, I do not know. He owns, I grant, that they referred their Cause to Almighty God, and left it to him to avenge their Injuries; but this is no Proof that they were obliged to do so in any case, where they were not forbidden to defend themselves. Tertullian, it is true, insists more upon the general Rules of loving, and wishing well to all Men; and that they were not only no Enemies to the

Empe-

Emperor, but even to no one else. But does he say this was the only Reason of their Non-resistance? By no means. And yet if he had, it would not follow, that our Religion may not allow to Resist some upon occasion, and yet restrain us from Resisting others. So that he has yet shewn no Reason, for disallowing the truth of those Principles, upon which the Practice of the Primitive Christians was founded. And so long as he allows Non-resistance to have been their Practice, and has not proved the Principles here mentioned, to be all it was founded upon, I may leave it to himself to reflect, how little he has done towards the invalidating their Testimony. And this I will assure him, that let him but once publicly own and invite to this Duty of Non-resistance, as a necessary part of Christianity, and what our Lord's Disciples are all obliged to, as they will discharge the Profession they have taken upon themselves, with a good Conscience, and I will have no farther Dispute with him about it, though he could not prevail with himself, to urge all the Arguments for it, that I have made use of in this Tract.

4. He appeals to *Origen* as a favourer of this Doctrine of Resistance; but to how little purpose will easily be made apparent. *Origen* was noted for some Singularities of Opinion, and especially as to the Eternal Torments of Hell. And if he had been singular too in the Instance before us, his Judgment would have been the less valuable upon this account. But there is no cause for such a Supposition concerning Resistance. Though Mr. H. notes it, (a) as *very remarkable*, that *Origen* should mention that celebrated Passage of S. Paul, Rom. 13. 1, &c. with such a Remark, as would incline one to think, that all the Primitive Christians did not see any such unlimited Non-resistance in it, as many have done since. This I confess is somewhat strange, that *Origen*, the same *Origen*, who, to use Mr. H.'s (b) own Words, challenged *Celsus*, that great Enemy to Christians, to name any Sedition, or Tumult, in which the Christians were concerned, and is by
some

some alledged for this in Defence of Passive Obedience; it is somewhat strange, I say, that he should give any reason to suspect that an unlimited Non-resistance was not taught in this place of the Apostle. However, let us attend to what he writes upon this subject. It seems the learned and indefatigable Dr. Whitty, in his Annotations on this Text of S. Paul, observes, that Origen having these Words in his Dissertation against Celsus, (a) confesses it is a place capable of much Disquisition, by reason of such Princes as govern Cruelly and Tyrannically, or who by reason of their Power fall into Effeminacy, and carnal Pleasures. This Passage Mr. H. presses here with this observation, which might have been learned from the Doctor too, That he would not at present undertake to give an exact account of it. From whence he thinks it manifest, not only that many of the first Christians doubted, whether the Subjection preached by S. Paul was due, in point of Conscience, to Tyrants and Oppressors; but also that Origen himself, when he wrote this, did not believe it to be so. This I am afraid is carrying the matter somewhat too far; and how manifest soever Mr. H. may think such a Consequence to be, I must confess myself so blind as not to see it, though I have tried all the ways I can to make it out. For that Origen did believe Tyrants irresistible, is to me much more manifest, not only from these Passages cited before (b) out of him, but more especially from his (c) Commentary upon these Words of the Apostle, as we have them in the Latin Edition of Joannes Parvus. For the Apostle having taught, *there is no Power but of God*, he takes occasion from hence to argue in the following manner: Perhaps some will say, what then? Is that Power which persecutes the Servants of God, impugns the Faith, subverts Religion, is this from God? To this we will briefly answer: Every body knows that our Sight and Hearing, and other Senses are given us by God. But when by God's Gift they are put in our power, it is in our power to use them either to good or bad Purposes; and yet this is no impeachment of God's Justice, that being given us with a good Intent, we yet abuse them

(a) L. 8. p. 421. (b) P. 47, & p. 136.

(c) In ep. ad Rom. cap. 13. lib. 9.

them to wicked and ungodly Purposes. In like manner all Power is given by God, for the Punishment of evil doers, but the Praise of them that do well, as the same Apostle says just after. Well, but what if they contradict the Character here laid down by S. Paul, and are not a Terrour to evil works, but to good; are not the Ministers of Good to the Virtuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only? In this case says Origen, the heavy Judgment of God will overtake those, who manage the Power committed to them, according to their own sinful Imaginations, and not according to the Divine Laws. Where he assures such, God Almighty will call them to account, for their impious Abuse of his Authority entrusted with them, without any the least intimation of the Peoples Right to rise up against them. Now I appeal to Mr. H. whether in writing a Commentary upon these Words, he would have delivered himself as Origen does here? And whether he would not have taken a quite contrary course, and instead of threatening such evil Magistrates only with the Divine Vengeance, he would not have told them rather that besides the heavy Punishment to be expected in the other World, they ought to remember that they had lost their Authority in this, and could not be called God's Vicegerents without the highest Prophaneß; and so a Passive Non-resistance to them would appear, upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary? This Mr. H. must have told them, if he would have spoken consonantly to his own Doctrine. But Origen did nothing less; He owned their Authority to be still as much from God, as our Senses are, when we abuse them to other Purposes than they were given us for, and warns them to take care of provoking God, lest so they bring upon themselves an irreparable Destruction, without any hint of an account to be given to their Subjects of their Misgovernment. And whilst Origen and Mr. H. so plainly interfere, and disagree in their management of this Portion of Scripture, it is hard to conceive they should both have the same Notion of Resistance, as Mr. H. would have it thought. But this I will say for him, he is the most expert at reconciling

Cor-

Contradictions, of any one I have ever met with. And to confirm what I have here said concerning *Origen*, it may farther be observed, that treating of the next Verse of this Chapter, he condemns complying with such Rulers, as take upon them to persecute the Faith, and requires to obey God rather than them; but mentions not one word of any liberty, their Subjects had to revenge the Ills they suffered by them. And again on the fifth Verse professes, that had not those who believed in Christ been subject to the temporal Powers, and paid them not only their Tribute, but that Fear and Honour which was due to them, they had deservedly provoked their Rulers and Governors to turn their Arms against them; & *persecutores quidem suos excusabiles, semet ipsos verò culpabiles redderent*, they would have taken the blame from their Persecutors, and laid it upon themselves. Which is not spoken like one who was a friend to Resistance upon occasion. So that when *Origen* complains of the Difficulties that may arise, in relation to tyrannical and persecuting Princes, which he would not take upon him to enquire into at that time, as perhaps not thinking it to his present purpose, or as hoping for a more convenient opportunity of doing it, or rather as supposing what he had said upon the Words themselves, to be a sufficient declaration of his Mind, as he seems to have thought it, or for whatsoever other Reason, I cannot see how this can any way prove the Lawfulness of Resisting such Princes. It is possible what *Origen* meant might relate to the Care to be taken, and the Circumspection to be used, by those that lived under bad Governors, that so they might not incur their Displeasure, and so come to feel the sad Effects of it. And if this be all that was here intended, as it may be for ought Mr. *H.* can shew to the contrary, and perhaps he will be of opinion that it is so, if he look back to the foregoing Words: If this, I say, be the case, I am confident, that he himself will yield it is of very little service to the purpose of Resistance. And yet again, if *Origen* were supposed to have been in his own private Opinion for Resistance, which he no way appears to have

have been, it were not so very justly done of Mr. *H.* to conclude from him alone that *MANY* of the first Christians concurred herein with him, whilst he says no such thing. When a Man speaks only his own Thoughts, without mentioning any one besides, it is too much to infer from thence, that *it is manifest* this was a common and usual Persuasion, and that *Many* others had come into it. Wherefore all I can collect from this Inference of Mr. *H.* is, that though he expresses himself ingeniously and smoothly, it will be very hard to prove that he argues closely. *Origen* speaks only his own Sense, and does not say that *Many* others were of the same Mind; and yet if he had, here is nothing to prove that either he, or they were for the Doctrine of Resistance.

Next comes a Passage of S. (a) *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*; but such as must have a very wrong Sense put upon it, to prevent its being a good Evidence against Resistance. The Words are these: (b) Δεδιδάγμεθα ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναις πλὴν κατὰ τὸ πεινῶμεν, καὶ μὴ βλάπτειν ἑαυτοὺς, ἀπονέμειν, *We are taught to give to Rulers, and the Powers ordained by God, as becomes us, such Honour as doth not hurt ourselves.* This says Mr. *H.* is plainly said with reference to the same place of S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; of which it is indeed too loose an Interpretation. But how if it be no Interpretation, and have no reference at all to this place? There is but one Phrase in it that in the least looks that way; and this will do Mr. *H.* little service, that is, his calling the Magistrates by the Name of the Powers ordained by God. Setting aside this, here is not a syllable that seems to have any relation to that Text. For the Martyr says not a word about not resisting with any sort of Force, but only of paying no more Honour, τὴν πλὴν, than they could pay with a safe Conscience. And what there is in this to entitle it to the Character, of an Interpretation of those Words of S. Paul, is more than I can possibly discover, and needs some of Mr. *H.*'s Wit, and Penetration to make it out. How-

(a) P. 145.

(b) Eccles. *Smyrnenf.* Epist. de S. *Polycarpi* Martyrio. c. 10.

However as if what he says had had an appearance of Truth, he proceeds to build upon it what he would have had the Martyr say. For he lays it down as undoubtedlly true, (though it is undoubtedly so, that these Words afford no ground at all for it,) that *this manifestly shews that there were Christians and Martyrs, amongst the immediate Successors of the Apostles, who did not imagine that S. Paul had obliged them to Subjection in all possible Cases: and who interpreted his Rules about the behaviour of Subjects, so as to leave them even greater Liberty, than what is given them in his Sermon.* And then he triumphantly tells us, *Here are two express and early Testimonies, making it highly probable that the Christians of the first Ages, did not interpret the Precepts of S. Paul concerning Subjection to the Higher Powers, so as not to allow the Lawfulness of Resistance in some Cases.* The former of these I have fully examined, and have shewn that Mr. H. has no cause to boast of Origen, as if he were on his side. I have also noted, that this Passage of S. Polycarp is neither for nor against him; and for this very good reason, because it is perfectly foreign to the matter now under debate. And now to press the Observation a little farther; here is nothing in the whole Passage about a Christian's Sufferings, and his Duty of Non-resistance; and all the Obedience that can be imagined to be implied in it, is *Active* only. It is *Honouring* the Emperor that is spoken of, and which the good Bishop professes they were ready to perform, so far as they reasonably and innocently could. And if this must be called Obedience, I will not contend about a Word, whenever I can possibly avoid it. However this I am sure of, *Passive Obedience* it can in no wise be; though it ought to have been so, to make it at all to Mr. H.'s purpose. The Case, in short was this: Polycarp was called upon by the Proconsul to *Swear by Caesar's Fortune*, which he utterly refused; yet with this Declaration in behalf of himself, and the others of his Religion, that they *had learned to pay, to the Principalities and Powers ordained by God, as was most just, all the Honour they could with safety to themselves, that is to say, to their Souls, and their*

Eternal

Eternal Welfare, as I have before (a) observed. This it seems somebody had (b) before signified to Mr. H. and upon it he seems to be sensible he had mistaken the Sence of the place ; but yet cannot find in his heart to retract it. He tells us, *It is objected that I have mistaken S. Polycarp. Be it so, it is of small importance, if so be I have not mistaken S. Paul.* But is this a Proof he has not mistaken S. Paul ? Or must it necessarily be concluded that he has not, though without any Proof, nay against all the Proof I have brought to the contrary ? I know no particular Privilege Mr. H. has above other Men, that should authorize him to expect this, and hope therefore that I may be thought pardonable, if I cannot give so easy an assent to so precarious a Claim. However, without any Proof that he has not mistaken S. Paul, as he did S. Polycarp, he proceeds, and tells us, *The Cause I have undertaken will not suffer by this.* Right, if he mean that this is not the *Cardo Controversia*. But that it will in no respect suffer by it, is not true, for it must suffer the Loss of what ever advantage was intended it by this mistaken Citation. This is unquestionable. But let us see what follows. *And for myself I am sure I was not wilfully guilty of mistaking, or misapplying what he saith in the Passage referred to.* Nor do I know any one that ever said his Mistake was wilful. All that I can find concerning his former Informant, or that I now pretend, is that the place is quite mistaken, and does not relate to the business in hand ; and it does not make it no mistake, that he did not wilfully fall into it.

And now after this Apology for his Error, who would not have expected that he should have quitted this Passage, and sought for some better Evidence ? This had been natural enough for any one to conceive. But Mr. H. knows better things. If the Words do not of themselves speak on his Side, he can wrest and torture them till he has brought them to his Beck, just as he did those of this Text. To this end he affirms

(a) P. 42, 43.

(b) See Pref. to his second Edition. p. XXXVIII.

affirms, *It is manifest of S. Polycarp, that at a time when it was for his Interest, and for the Interest of the Christian Religion, that he should speak as highly as possible of the Obedience to Magistrates, he is far from representing S. Paul, and the Christian Religion, as some Persons have since done; but is content with a general and loose Expression concerning the Obedience required by it.* Which makes it necessary for me to remind him of what I have already proved, that these Words relate not to those of S. Paul, as indeed they do not; but rather to the first Commandment, or those Words of our Blessed Saviour, *(a) Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;* or any other of those Texts either in the Old and New Testament, which forbid paying Divine Worship to any other than God only. And when he was Pleading upon this Point with the Proconsul, it would have been an unreasonable thing to fancy that he must needs leave the Business he was upon, and fall upon an unseasonable Discourse about Loyalty to Princes, to settle and extend the Bounds and Extent of that. This I dare say is a Task, that none but Mr. H. would have pretended to impose upon him.

But he contented himself with a very general and loose Expression concerning Obedience to Government. Be it so; then all that follows from hence is, that he did not argue like a Disputant. And no wonder, considering that Disputation was not his Business. It is much better, that he spake like a true Christian, and a devout Father of the Church; like one that was ready to sacrifice all for his Saviour, and for preserving a good Conscience, under all the Temptations he met with to the contrary; professing to the Proconsul, the chief Magistrate of the Place under the Emperor, that he was ready prepared to pay all the Obedience that was consistent with his Duty to his superiour Lord and Master, was willing to comply with *(a)* all the Lawful Commands of his

M

Earthly

(a) S. Mat. 4. 10.

(b) Thus likewise speak Tertullian and St. Basil, both whom Mr. H. if he had pleased, might as well have pressed on his side; and

Earthly Governors, though not with such as endangered his Eternal Salvation: He had the Fear of God before his Eyes, and would not offend him by any Idolatrous and Forbidden Worship, whatever he might suffer for it in this World. But as for any other sort of Honour or Obedience, such as was proper and becoming, καὶ τὸ προσήκον, that is to say, as best suited with their holy Religion, this he would never be backward to pay. His great Concern was the Salvation of his immortal Soul, and so long as nothing Destructive of this was required, he would not fail to shew himself a very loyal and dutiful Subject. But when a Subjection was exacted which would hurt him in the most Sensible Part, would violate his Conscience, and expose him to the eternal Indignation of Almighty God, then he thought it time to look about him, and do nothing that might prove of such pernicious Consequence, though he suffered ever so much for it at the present. This is the natural and genuine meaning of this good Bishop's Answer, and it cannot be wrested to another Sense, with any shew of Reason. And this Interpretation is farther confirmed by the Words immediately following: Οὗ ὁ ἀνθύπατος πρὸς αὐτὸν, &c. *Hereupon the Proconsul told him; I have my Beasts at hand, which will immediately tear you limb from limb, if I but command you to be delivered to them: And I will do it, unless you change your Behaviour, and pay more regard to my Orders.* Whereto the Saint returns Answer, not that if he were able he would prevent his Cruelties, by calling

and each of them would have done him as much service, as this devout Martyr, that is to say, none at all. Satis præscriptum habemus, &c. says the former, It is plainly enough enjoined us, as we are very sensible, that we ought to pay all Subjection according to the Apostle's Direction, being subject to Principalities, and Powers, and Magistrates, provided we transgress not our Bounds, so as to defile ourselves with any Idolatrous Compliance. De Idololatr. c. 15. And to the same purpose the latter teaches That it is our Duty to be subject to the Higher Powers, ἐν οἷς ἀν' ἐντολὴν δεῖ μὴ ἐμπαύσκειν, whilst they interfere not with any Divine Law. Moral. Reg. 79.

calling him to an account for them; not that he would make any Opposition against him, nor would encourage others to do it; but as became a sincere, devout, good Christian, *Call them*, says he, *for my Mind is fixed*. And when threatened again, that since he so unconcernedly slighted the Beasts, he should be cast into the Fire till reduced to Ashes, if he would not comply, he returns no other Answer but this; *Πῶς ἀπειλῆς τὸ πῶς ἔσται κατόρθωρον, &c.* *Alas! all the Fire you have to terrify me with, is only such as burns for a little time, and will presently go out: But you do not know that God has prepared another more lasting, an inextinguishable, eternal Fire, for the Punishment of such as transgress his Divine Laws: Make no delay therefore, but do with me what you will.* This is a plain and true account of what passed between the Proconsul and this holy Martyr. And would it not sadly puzzle a Man of less Ingenuity than Mr. H. to find out how this can possibly serve the Doctrine of Resistance? since every one must presently see, that it points directly at another Life, and the grand Concern Christians have to make sure of a happy Estate in that, but has not the least mention of the Safety and Welfare of this, nor one syllable concerning that Good of the Community, which Mr. H. makes the only Rule of his Submission.

Yet he pursues his Design, and tells us farther, *It is manifest that in the Passage referred to, he hath Rom. 13. 1. in view, and that this holy Martyr thinks it sufficient to tell the Proconsul, that the Obedience taught and enjoined in that Passage, is κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα, and such as doth not hurt ourselves.* Doth this look as if he thought Absolute Obedience of any sort required by S. Paul? Nay, doth it not appear, that it was his Opinion, that the Honour and Obedience of any sort here required by S. Paul, was only such as doth not hurt ourselves? Well, since Mr. H. is once in, I find he is resolved to wade through thick and thin, and nothing shall stop him. He will not go with Mahomet to the Mountain, but will contrive some way or other to make the Mountain come to Mahomet. The Lawfulness of Resistance must be maintained; and he is

M 2

fully

fully resolved it shall, rather than have his fine Scheme sink, for want of a Support. Here therefore he lays it down as *manifest*, that in this Passage the holy Martyr had Rom. 13. in view, and was teaching how far Christians were to suffer from the Higher Powers, and when they might and ought to resist them. And yet I dare say, let him ask any Man, not before intoxicated with his Notions, and he will readily tell him, that this is pure *Chimera* and Imagination, and that there is not the shadow of a Reason for conceiving, that he had any regard to that Passage of *S. Paul* in this Discourse with the Proconsul. And I do not know what *Mr. H.* thinks of it, but I should be heartily ashamed to make him talk so improperly, as when the Proconsul calls him to *Swear and Renounce Christ*, instead of giving him a pertinent Answer, to go quite off from his Business, and read a Lecture to him concerning the Lawfulness of Resistance, and the Care that ought to be taken, for the Preservation of the Society he belonged to. This is such an Indignity put upon the Great and Good Man, as I hope *Mr. H.* when he has better considered it, will not persist in; and that his Admirers also will take notice, how little his Interpretations are to be depended upon, and upon what Dangers they run themselves by embracing them.

But *Mr. H.* lays a great Stress upon these Words, *καὶ τὸ προσήκον*, as is most proper or expedient, and *οὐ μὴ βλάπτουσιν ἡμᾶς*, such as will not hurt us. As if these must necessarily relate to our present Expedience and Safety; whereas I have shewn that they are spoken with respect to what is of infinitely greater Importance, and we are therefore abundantly more obliged to take care of, the eternal Salvation and Happiness of our Souls. And can any thing be more proper, more expedient, than above all things to provide for this? Or can any thing hurt us more, than what tends to our everlasting Destruction? The things of this World are not wholly unworthy of our Regard; but *Mr. H.* must own, those of the other call for it a thousand times more; and whatever endangers the Loss of them, hurts

us incomparably beyond all the Miseries and Calamities, the Cruelties and Tortures, the Pains and Deaths we can possibly undergo here. And it requires a great deal of Ingenuity, and I hope I may be pardoned if I say some Disingenuity too, to make all the unspeakable Concern the *Saint* had for these, to terminate in the Doctrine of *Resisting the Higher Powers*, contrary to the Laws both of God and Man.

So that upon the whole, Mr. *H.* could find amongst all the ancient Christian Writers, but two that he could any way fancy to patronize his Hypothesis; and how *manifestly* they have done it, I hope the Reader is sensible by this time; the one of them is against him, and the other is treating of another matter, and says not a word to the Point that he would have him.

Well, but if Mr. *H.* cannot prove that Two, or so much as one of them, will chime in with him, he is not yet discouraged, but like an undaunted Champion, will prove in the next place that their Universal Submission and Patience under the greatest and most undeserved and so most unjust Hardships, is no Evidence that they were not however convinced of the Lawfulness of Resistance. To this End he subjoins (a) these two Considerations.

I. *A particular Party of Men may be barbarously used in a Nation, and yet it may not be for the Publick Good, that they should defend themselves by entering into an open War against their Prince, and especially when it is the Opinion of the whole Body, except themselves, that the Publick Happiness would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than by their Preservation. This was the Case of the Primitive Christians, &c.* I doubt Mr. *H.* has not considered, that this directly condemns the *Camisars* in *France*, for resisting their Persecuting Prince; for it is plain they are but a *Party*, and comparatively a very small one; and it is the Opinion of the whole Body, excepting themselves, that the Publick Happiness would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than by their Preservation; and

M 3

yet

yet they have entered into an open War against their Prince. So that it is impossible for them to escape Mr. H.'s Censure. I cannot in Conscience be an Advocate for them; but yet I have this to say for myself, that neither I, nor any one else, need to condemn them more positively than Mr. H. does in this place. And this Condemnation of them he must own, till he shall think fit to retract what is here asserted. He condemns the *Rochellers* too for their Attempts formerly to vindicate themselves, against the Forces of their Sovereign. And he condemns the *Dutch* for rising against the King of *Spain*, and casting off his Yoke, whilst the whole Body of his Subjects, themselves excepted, were of Opinion, the Publick Happiness would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than their Preservation.

But that which I would offer as more material to our present purpose, is, that the Primitive Christians did not, that I can find any where, any of them, so much as once resolve their patient Submission and Non-resistance into their Regard for that Publick Good, Mr. H. is so over-fond of. They give another account of their quiet suffering all Indignities and Barbarities, namely that they did it out of Duty to Almighty God, and in hope of attaining to a better State by it, in another World. They would have despised such a Plea as this, and thought themselves highly dishonoured by it, as esteeming it beneath the Followers of the Blessed Jesus, to make any thing here in this World the End they aimed at in their Sufferings. They had an unconceivably nobler Prospect in view, that enflamed their Souls with an ardent Desire after it, as their greatest and chiefest Good, namely the eternal Enjoyment of God and their Blessed Saviour in the highest Heavens. And this it was, not any Hope of temporal Felicity, that carried them so resolutely and successfully through all their Conflicts, and made them more than Conquerors through him that loved them.

But still they were a Party only, and not the whole Body of the Empire. True, they were so; but a very numerous Party, as I have shewn from *Tertullian*, *S. Cyprian*,

prian, S. *Augustin*, from *Socrates*, and from *Pliny* too. And was it for the Good of the Empire that such a large Body of Men should be *destroyed rather than preserved*? If it was not, their being only a Party was no just Ground for their Non-resistance. If it was, it will be kindly done in Mr. *H.* to let us know, what Persecution may not be justified at this rate. For no Prince persecutes all his People together, but one Party only, though sometimes the greater Party; and usually the rest of his Subjects, or at least a considerable part of them are in Opinion with him, and against those he persecutes.

Wherefore seeing this Doctrine condemns such as Rebels, whom I persuade myself Mr. *H.* would not readily condemn as such; since it gives a different Reason, for the quiet Sufferings of the Primitive Christians, from what they give themselves, and which they would never have desired to be given for them; and since, *lastly*, there was hardly ever any Persecution but might be justified by it; I need say no more to prove the Weakness and Insufficiency, and Unreasonableness of it.

2. *It was very much for the Honour and Propagation of their Holy Religion, whilst they were but a Party of Subjects, not concerned in the management of State-Affairs, that they should engage the Love of the Princes of the World, and attract the Hearts of all Men to their Profession, by their signal Patience and Submission, to the greatest Injuries and Torments imaginable; but it must be extremely to the Disgrace and Hindrance of their Religion, if it obliged them, when they became the Majority, or the Whole of a Nation, and many of them necessarily concerned in the management of the Publick, to submit themselves to be ruined, and made miserable at the Will of their Prince.* But can any greater Dishonour be done to our most holy Religion, than thus to represent it as a Politick Engine, intended for the Service of temporal and secular Aims, teaching its Professors meekly to submit whilst they are kept under; but that if ever they got strength enough to rebell, they were bound in duty to do it, and must be sure to op-

pose and resist their Sovereign with all their Might, rather than suffer unjustly by him? A Doctrine, much fitter for a *Matchiavel*, than a Preacher of the Gospel of Peace, and Submission, and Patience under undeserved ill Usage. And which, setting the Divine Providence aside, as Mr. *H.* has done throughout his whole Scheme, if in some Conjunctions it ever prove useful in this World, yet it is much to be feared, will meet with but an uncomfortable Recompence in that which is to come.

Besides, this is a Doctrine, that I presume was to be kept as a great Secret, and not divulged upon any account, lest so it should unluckily defeat its own Design. For it is impossible to think of any more powerful Argument, to persuade Princes to suppress and weaken the Christians, and by all means imaginable prevent their ever getting into Power, than the letting them know that this Power would, upon all occasions, be turned upon themselves. Could any readier course be taken, to set all the Rulers in the World against them, than a discovery of these pernicious Principles, *hurtful to Kings and Princes*, and even to the Christians themselves, who instead of *attracting the Hearts of all Men to their Profession*, would have hereby rendered it odious, and abominable, and set all honest Men against it, as tending to the Disturbance of Mankind, and the Subversion of all States and Kingdoms, that were so easy as to give it admittance amongst them? And whether this would have been mightily for its Advantage, I shall not need to say. It follows, (a)

By the former, their quiet Submission, they demonstrated to all the World the Power of their Faith, in cases in which it was honourable for them to suffer, and to prefer the Publick Peace before their own private Interest. And does it not then unavoidably follow, that their Faith would appear much more illustrious, by Suffering when it was in their power to prevent it, if they could have allowed themselves to attempt so great a Wickedness? This would
they

shew beyond all Contradiction, that they had a far greater Good in their eye, than the Peace and Welfare of Society, even the Joys of Heaven and a Blessed Eternity. Their Hopes would hereby evidently appear, to be set upon another Life. And every one that saw their meek and patient Suffering, when humanly speaking they had it in their power to save themselves, must confess they *had their Conversation truly in Heaven*, and undoubtedly preferred the Bliss and Felicity of the other State, before all the Conveniences and Advantages of this; and that they certainly believed with S. Ignatius, That (a) *the nearer they drew to the end of their Conflict, the nearer they were to the perpetual Enjoyment of Almighty God*; and as Cæcilius speaks in Minutius Felix, (b) *the Dread they had of everlasting Death, set them above the Fear of any the worst of Deaths, that could befall them here*. This was greatly for the Honour of their Religion; and made it manifest to all the World, that its Professors were acted by greater Hopes and Expectations, and by a nobler Principle of Reliance upon God to take care of them, than the rest of Mankind. And the more easily they could have promised themselves, to shake off the Tyranny of their Persecutors, so much the more gloriously would their Submission and Patience recommend them to the Beholders. And never therefore could this their Obedience appear, to such singular Advantage, nor shew so plainly what mighty Influence their Faith had upon them, to set them above all the Terrors, or Allurements, of this World, as when Mr. H. says, *It would have been extremely to the Disgrace and Hindrance of their Religion, that is to say, when they became the Majority, or the Whole of a Nation, and many of them necessarily concerned in the management of the Publick*. As I think all the World must allow, except Mr. H.

But he tells us farther, That upon this Supposition nothing could be concluded, but that Christianity was an Enemy

to

(a) Ἐγὼς μαχαίρας, ἐγὼς δεῖ· μεταξὺ θνήσκω, μεταξὺ δεῖ. B. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn.

(b) Dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent.

to the Publick Good of Human Society; that it tended to conclude whole Nations under Tyranny and Slavery, and that it obliged Men to give up the Rights of an whole Society, and the Happiness of the Generations to come. Here Mr. H. speaks like himself; I mean like one who, I am sorry I am forced so oft to repeat it, shews no dependance upon Providence, nor dares believe the Scriptures, when they direct (a) to cast all our Care upon God, with a Promise that if we do so, he will be sure to take care of us; and again, That (b) all things shall work together for good, to them that love God. And yet he is as positive in what he affirms, as if it were true; though it is certain nothing in the World is less so. For something else may unquestionably be concluded upon this Supposition. For it may be concluded, as I said, that those who acted in this manner, chiefly preferred the eternal Happiness of the other State, of which they had so lively an impression upon their Souls, that they could readily despise all things else, in comparison of it. It might moreover be concluded, that that must necessarily be a truly noble, a divine and heavenly Religion, that could set Men so far above the World, and make them willingly endure all sorts of Tortures and Cruelties, in obedience to its Precepts, and a firm belief of that inestimable *Recompence of Reward* it had set before them. And again it may be hence concluded, that Christianity teaches to leave the management of this World, to God who made it, and knows best how to order all things in it, and that the Christian's business is to serve God, and secure his own Eternal Welfare, and not make any temporal Good, whether his Own, or that of the Society he belongs to, the Rule to steer his course by. These are plain and easy Consequences from this Supposition; and that Mr. H. could not see them, shews only the Power of Prejudice, and too great an Attachment to his own Politicks, and his dearly beloved Doctrine of Resistance.

Once more Mr. H. adds, *Something like this seems to have*

(a) 1 S. Pet. 5. 7.

(b) Rom. 8. 28.

have been the Foundation of the Difference of the Behaviour of the Primitive Christians when they were but a Party, from their Behaviour, when they had by their Patience, and Submission, gained so much ground as to become a Majority, and to be necessarily engaged in the management of State-Affairs. For after this we do not find that they thought themselves obliged by their Religion to bear every thing with that Quiet and Silent Submission they had before practised. What Times or Places Mr. H. refers to here, he has not been pleased to inform us, and I am not willing to argue at random and by guess. Only I see he points still at the *Primitive Christians*. And whenever he will give himself the trouble to shew, that those *Primitive Christians* did at any time think themselves no longer obliged by their Religion, to bear every thing quietly and submissively as they had done before, I shall be ready to give him such an Answer as I hope may convince him of his Mistake. At present I desire it may be remembered, that here is only his own bare Word for it, or rather not so much as that, but only a Declaration, That he does not find they thought it. Which is no Proof at all, that they did not both think and practise it.

I conclude therefore, that having shewn both the Doctrine and Practice of the *Primitive Christians*, (a) whose universal Consent is the best Exposition of the holy Scriptures in this point, to be against all Resistance of the Higher Powers, that they lived by Faith and not by Sense, and would by no means venture the hazarding their eternal Salvation in the other World, for the preservation, either of Themselves, or the Community they belonged to in this; and having moreover particularly answered all Mr. H.'s Objections to the contrary, and shewn them to have nothing of Force or Solidity in them, I may very well reckon myself to have fully discharged my Undertaking in this respect; and that I

am

(a) Ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ πίστις ἐστὶν ἡ ὁρθή, καὶ ἐκ διδασκαλίας Ἀποστόλων ὁρμαινέη, καὶ παραδόστως τῶν πατέρων βεβαιωμένη, ἐκ νεύας καὶ παλαιάς διὰθήκης. B. Athanas. Ep. ad Adelph. c. Arian. p. 159.

am now at liberty to proceed to the Third thing I propounded; which was to consider the Doctrine of our own Church, and shew that this is exactly of the same Strain with that of the primitive and best Times of Christianity. This therefore I design for the Subject of the next Chapter.

C H A P. III.

What the Doctrine of our Church is in relation to this Duty of Non-resistance.

WHAT the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians were in relation to their Governors, how patient and submissive their Behaviour was, and how far they always were from ever attempting to resist those in Authority, though when powerfully tempted to it, I have already shewn somewhat largely, and come now to observe that our own Church's Doctrine in this point, is most exactly conformable to theirs. Not that it needs any long or elaborate Proof, it has been several Years since so fully made out, in the remarkable History of Passive Obedience. A Book wholly made up of Citations against Resistance, collected especially out of our own most celebrated Authors since the Reformation, together with some others, both of the Scots and Irish, and *Erasmus, Grotius, Casaubon, Bochart, Beza, Luther, Calvin*, and several other Foreigners, all concurring in the same Principle. Here are such a croud of Witnesses, and divers of them in the highest Stations, as are abundantly enough to outweigh all the Evidence Mr. *H.* can bring to the contrary. Such a Collection of such eminent Writers upon this subject, as most of them are, is a good Proof of that Church's Doctrine in this respect whereto they belonged. As whosoever will be at the pains of consulting the Book itself, may easily be satisfied.

fied. Thither therefore I refer the Reader; and shall content myself to make some few Additions of Passages, either omitted by that diligent Author, or else not published till after the compiling of that Collection, and then shall set down the Doctrine of the Homilies in this point, somewhat more fully and particularly than that Author hath done.

Bishop *Andrews* on the Fifth Commandment speaks thus: (a) “ The Wickedness of the Person cannot take away the Commandment, nor make God’s Ordinance void: *Rom.* 13. 1. All Power and Ordinance is from God, so no Evil can make it void. Evil is twofold, either which runneth to the *Punishment*, or to the Fault. 1: For *Roughness* or *Oppression*: 1 *Pet.* 2. 18. Obedience must be given to the Crooked and Forward, to such as *Holofernes*, *Judith* 3. 8. such as nothing will please; Example, *Gen.* 16. 16. of *Sarah* and *Agar*. Although *Sarah* dealt roughly with *Agar*, yet the Angel willeth her to return to her Mistress, and submit herself to her. And as in the *Family*, so in the *Commonwealth*. It is known how *Saul* dealt with *David*: yet *Psal.* 120. v. last, he saith, *He sought peace with those that loved not peace*; that is, acknowledged *Submission*, offering no violence neither in the Cave, nor in the Bed. 2. For the other wicked *Governors*, be they never so hard, it is plain likewise, that to them *Obedience* and *Honour* is due. For as it is true, *Hos.* 10. 3. that God in *ira*, in his anger, denieth us a Prince: so also *Hos.* 13. 11. he giveth a King in his wrath; expounded *Job* 34. 30. that it is the Peoples fault, for their Sins. *Hos.* 8. 4. It is his doing, because the People would have it so. — Because *Ephraim* will have Altars to sin, they shall, &c. In the New Testament, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. Prayers for *Governors*, though no Christians; 1 *Pet.* 2. 18. Obey the King, *Nero*: and *Acts* 25. 11. *Appello Casarem*, I appeal unto *Cesar*: *Paul* useth the benefit of his Government, refuseth his *Deputy*, and appealeth
“ to

“ to Nero himself. Only this add out of *S. Chrysostom*,
 “ ἀξίωμα ἔκ ἐστὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ἀλλὰ τὸ διατάξας τῷ θεῷ. The
 “ Honour we give, is done, not to Man, but to God
 “ himself. We reverence the Ordinance of God in
 “ Men, not Man, so that Honour is due not *πρὸς αὐτὸν*,
 “ but *πρὸς τὸν ποιῶν*, to the Vizard that God hath put
 “ upon the Man’s Person : more plain, *Ester* 6. 8. *Ha-*
 “ *man* counselleth the King, Thus shall it be done, to
 “ the Man whom the King would have honoured : he
 “ shall put on a Robe of Estate, &c. And *Mordecai*
 “ a base Man, was so honoured, and yet returned to
 “ his private Estate. The Honour there, was done to
 “ the King’s Robes, and Crown, not to the private
 “ Man. Thus we must conceive of evil Men ; that
 “ they are invested in the Lord’s Robes and Crown ; to
 “ which we give Honour, not to the Man.” Nothing
 can be plainer, than that this great Prelate teaches Obe-
 dience and Submission to the worst of Princes ; not up-
 on their own account, but because of the relation they
 stand in to Almighty God, as his Deputies and Mini-
 sters, and because of the Character and Authority they
 have received from him.

Before whom I should have mentioned the Martyr *Tyn-*
dale in his (a) Notes on the thirteenth Chapter to the *Ro-*
mans, where he has this Observation, as pat to my purpose,
 as could be desired ; which I shall here set down in his
 own Words and Spelling. *Thoughe thou were of*
polvre to resiste the Magistrates, yet shoulde
thy conscience condemne the, yf thou dydeste
it, because God commaundeth the, to do both
good and euil at theyr commaundement : but
to do the good thynges that they commaunde,
and yf they commaunde the anie euil, to save
with Peter and John, it is oure parte rather
to obeye God, then men. And yet lyfte no
weapon agaynst them, but patiently suffer at
theyr handes whatsoeuer tyrannye they will
execute vpon the, for not doyng theyr com-
maundements.

The

The Protestants (God be thanked) says Dr. Fulke, (a) at this day, as always, are obedient to wicked Princes, unto Death and Martyrdom.

The Lord Bishop of *Sarum* in his *Second Part of the Enquiry into the Reasons for Abrogating the Test, &c.* speaking of the Times about the Second Council of *Nice*, expresses himself thus: (b) "We will not much dispute concerning an Age, in which the World seemed mad with a Zeal for the Worship of *Images*; and in which *Rebellion*, and the Deposing of Princes upon the pretence of Heresy, began to be put in practice: Such Times as these, we willingly yield up to our Adversaries." Where his Lordship plainly condemns the Doctrine of Deposing Heretical Princes; and it will not be easy for Mr. *H.* to shew why Princes faulty in other respects are any more to be deposed than they. And before this, says his Lordship, (c) "We are not to consider the Writings of some particular Persons, so much as what hath been the generally received Opinion among the Protestant Writers, and most taught in their Pulpits and Schools. And whoever will attempt the contradicting that this hath been for Absolute Submission, it must be confessed to be hard to determin, whether his IGNORANCE be most to be pitied, or his CONFIDENCE most wondered at." What Answer Mr. *H.* will return his Lordship in this case, I will not pretend to guess. For my own part I only leave the Words with him and proceed. Mr. *Brown*, Rector of *Sligo* in *Ireland*, in his Sermon entituled *The Subjects Sorrow: Or Lamentations upon the Death of Brittain's Josiah*, lately reprinted, speaks thus: (d) "A King in his Kingdom is *solo Deo minor*, inferiour to God only, says *Tertullian*, and then surely above his People. *Deo subditus*, subject to God only, says *S. Ambrose* unto *Valentinian*. *Princeps legibus solutus est*, that the King is free from the Power of the Law, (is

" a

(a) On Rom. 13.1.

(b) Collection of eighteen Papers, &c. p. 223.

(c) First Conference. p. 73. (d) P. 15.

“ a Maxim as old as Christianity) that is, from the Pe-
 “ nalties of it. Laws have only a *directive*, not a *coer-*
 “ *cive* Power over him ; though not as a mortal Man,
 “ yet in his politick consideration, he is above the Law.
 “ *Divino sunt judicio reservandi Reges*, Kings stand or
 “ fall unto their own Master, God ; *satis est ad pœnam*
 “ *quòd Deum habeant ultorem*, it is sufficient that God
 “ will punish their Crimes ; He is the only Judge,
 “ not the People, unto whom our Appeal lies against
 “ the Injuries of their Proceedings.

Mr. March of Newcastle in his Sermon on *Judges* 19:
 30. 1676-7. affirms, (a) “ It was the Glory and Brag of the
 “ Primitive Christians, that they could never be bran-
 “ ded for Traytors, or condemned for Rebels. Their
 “ Religion allowed them not to fight against their Prin-
 “ ces, but according to S. Paul’s Exhortation, they of-
 “ fered up their Prayers for the very worst of Tyrants:
 “ — The (b) Papists alone had for many Ages the
 “ Monopoly of murdering Princes, of raising Rebel-
 “ lions under the colour of Religion, and Canonizing
 “ for Saints *Beckets*, *Garnets*, and the most prodigious
 “ Traytors : But that they have now any Pretence of
 “ discharging part of this Guilt upon Protestants them-
 “ selves, ought to be matter of Lamentation to us ; and
 “ could we command all the Tears of a *Jeremy*, they
 “ would hardly suffice to wash away the Stain of this
 “ day’s Guilt. But as we have too much cause to be-
 “ wail, that the Papists have got some Protestants
 “ amongst us to be *Fratres in malo*, Brethren in such hor-
 “ rid Wickednesses with themselves ; so we must withal
 “ tell them, That the Church of *England* is no more
 “ concerned in this barbarous Fact, than any State is
 “ in the Crimes of those Malefactors, who suffer daily
 “ by the Sword of Justice.” And in his Sermon on
 S. *Mat.* 7. 15, 16. (c) reckoning up dangerous Prin-
 ciples that had been industriously propagated, for carry-
 ing on the Rebellion against King *Charles I.* he instances,
 amongst others, in this : “ That to disobey Princes,
 “ who

(a) P. 23.

(b) P. 24.

(c) P. 20.

who submit their Scepters unto Christ's, is indeed
 Rebellion; but to Resist, and take up Arms against
 wicked Princes, is just, lawful, and warrantable.
 Whereupon he asks, " But how contrary is this both
 to the Precepts and Examples of Christ and his A-
 postles? We know, says he, Christ commands us to
 lay down our Lives without the least Resistance, for
 his and the Gospel's sake: And what our Saviour
 taught by Precepts, he taught by Example too; for
 he lived and died an obedient Subject unto *Cesar*,
 patiently submitting himself to his wicked Gover-
 nors. Has not *S. Paul* also told us plainly that they
 who Resist shall receive to themselves Damnation,
 and that we ought to be subject not only for Wrath,
 but also for Conscience sake? And when did *S. Paul*
 preach such Doctrines as these, but when such Mon-
 sters of Wickedness, as *Caligula*, *Claudius*, and *Nero*
 swayed the Scepters of the World?

Dr. *Calamy* (a) affirms " *There is nothing more evi-*
dent than that this Principle, that it is lawful in
some cases for Subjects by force to resist their King,
and Sovereign, doth open a wide Door to all manner
of Disorder and Confusion. For if ever it be lawful
for Subjects to resist the Sovereign Power, then it fol-
lows that Subjects have always a right to judge, whe-
ther their present Case be such, as that they may
lawfully resist in; and if they be Judges, this Propo-
sition that Subjects may resist in some cases, of which
themselves are Judges, is the same as to say, that
they may do it whenever they shall think fit for to
do it; and thus any Suspicion or Discontent taken
up against the Government, any Grievance we may
fancy, any thing our Governor doth that is miscon-
strued or misinterpreted, will be thought a justifiable
Pretence for taking up Arms against him, which ne-
cessarily lays the Foundation of everlasting Wars and
Troubles. I might therefore sufficiently evince the
falseness of this Principle, from the inevitable mis-
 N chievous

chievous Consequences of it; but it rather becomes the place I now stand in to shew how wicked and unchristian a Doctrine it is. And there is nothing more plainly and solemnly condemned by the Laws of our Religion, than for Subjects by force of Arms on any occasion to resist the Supreme Power and Authority, let it be in one single Person, or more, according to the different Forms of Government in several Countries. Or to speak as the case is amongst our selves, it is never lawful by our Religion on any Pretence to resist the King, or any authorised by the King, whom we all acknowledge in the Oath of *Supremacy* to be *the only Supreme Governor of this Realm*, and if he be *the only Supreme*, there is no Power on Earth equal or coordinate to his, any more, than there is a Superiour.

Dr. Meriton in a Sermon preached at S. Martyn's in the Fields, and dedicated to the Earls of Northumberland, Salisbury, Mulgrave, the Lord Seymour and others, professes of David, That (a) "He thought a Kingdom dear bought with contracting the Guilt of Royal Blood upon him, and resolves better, *Destroy him not, for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's Anointed and be guiltless?* ——— They [Kings] must, it is true, be accountable to him, [*the King of Kings*] but upon Earth their sacred Persons cannot be judged and sentenced by their Peers.

"I do find and feel, says Mr. Edward Symmons, (b) that God's Word ties my Conscience to obey every one of the King's Commands, (that are not against Piety) yea his Personal, as well as his Legal, and those first in case of difference; nor do I (for my part) obey the King's Law, because it is established, or because of its known Penalty annexed, nor yet the King himself because he rules according to his Law; these are not my Grounds of Obedience; but I obey the King's Law, because I obey the King; and I obey the King; because I obey God; I obey the King and his Law, " because

“ because of God and his Law, which I hold to be the
 “ best Obedience, and that of a Christian Man.

Mr. Long of Exeter in a Thanksgiving Sermon preached July 26. 1685. argues thus. (a) “ If any Cause
 “ could justify *Resistance* against a lawful Power, that
 “ of *David* against *Saul* might be warranted, *Saul* being
 “ rejected of God as a bloody Man; and having first
 “ despised his Commandment; and *David* a man after God’s
 “ own heart, Chosen and Anointed to succeed him;
 “ yet neither the *Wickedness* of *Saul*, nor the *Holy Unction*
 “ of *David*, was thought a sufficient Cause to lift up
 “ Hands against him, though *Saul* had persecuted him
 “ with so much Malice, and so uncessantly sought his
 “ Destruction, that he concluded he should one day per-
 “ ish by the hand of *Saul*; and God had more than once
 “ delivered *Saul* up into *David*’s Hands, so that he
 “ might have pleaded Providence; and he was provo-
 “ ked to take away *Saul*’s Life, for the preservation of his
 “ own; and when, to let *Saul* know that he had an
 “ opportunity to take away his Life, he cut off the skirt
 “ of his garment, *David*’s heart smote him for it, and to
 “ his Person the *Holy Unction* of *Saul* was a *Nolle me tan-*
 “ gere; for who, says he, can lift up his hand against the
 “ Lord’s anointed, and be guiltless? ——— (b) As
 “ there is no preceding Cause can justify *Resistance* of
 “ lawful Princes; so neither any Design or subsequent
 “ Effect; No man may do evil that good may come of it.

So also says Dr. Thompson Dean of Bristol, in a Ser-
 mon preached in the Cathedral Church there, June 21.
 1685. (c) “ Subjects are not only to obey them that
 “ are Religious, and whom they acknowledge to be
 “ Christian; but even those who are of a contrary Re-
 “ ligion, and when they persecute and oppose theirs.
 “ Subjects must submit to those Princes, if they be theirs.
 “ For they are still the Ordinances of God, whatever else
 “ they be. ——— Since Christ’s Kingdom is of another
 “ nature, his Soldiers are not to fight against their Tem-
 “ poral Governor even in Defense of Christ himself.

N 2

“ There

“ There is nothing so *Unchristian*, (a) nothing so *Unreasonable*, as for Subjects to seek Occasions to dispute the *Wills* and *Pleasures* of their *Princes*; and how much more, to rail *Tumults*, and levy *Arms* against them? Yea though they were *Heathens* and *Tyrants*, and the *most professed Enemies* that can be imagined to God and Goodness.

Mr. *Graile* of *Norfolk* in his Third Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of *Norwich* (b) speaks thus. “ What if it should be granted that the cause of Mens Fears and Jealousies concerning the future State of a Kingdom, is true and real? The worst that any good Man can fear, from any lawful Sovereign whatsoever, is suffering under him; but it is far better to suffer wrong than to do it. And when Suffering cannot be avoided, (as in this World it sometimes cannot) ’tis far more tolerable to suffer under the severest Government of one rightful Prince, than under the illegal Tyranny of numerous Invaders, who assume the greatest and most unbounded Power, without the least right to any Authority.

How earnestly the learned Bishop *Beveridge* presses this Duty in his *Private Thoughts upon Religion*, declaring that “ The Wrath of God shall as certainly fall upon those that rise up against the King, as upon those that fight against God; that it is not the *Holiness*, but the *Authority of God* that the Prince represents, and that the *most wicked*, as well as the *most holy* Person may be endowed with, &c.” I have (c) already observed, and shall not here repeat it; but shall only note what I meet with to this purpose in (d) a Sermon of his on 1 S. Pet. 2. 13. “ By every Ordinance of Man he means all, and every one that is entrusted with the Government of the Place or Country where we live. First, the King, or supreme Magistrate, who receives his Commission immediately from God himself, and therefore is accountable to none but him for the
“ execution

(a) P. 19, 20. (b) P. 119, 120. (c) Part. I. p. 71, 72, 73.
(d) Vol. 10. Sermon XIII. p. 404, 405, 406.

“ execution of it, as the Apostle here plainly intimates,
 “ in that he calls him *the Supreme*; for if he be Supreme,
 “ then all other Persons in his Kingdoms are inferiour
 “ to him, both singly and jointly: So that neither any
 “ one, nor all together, can justly pretend to any Power
 “ over him, because they are all under him; otherwise
 “ he would not be the Supreme, as the Apostle here
 “ calls him. Neither is this Duty to be performed on-
 “ ly to the King himself, but as the Apostle adds, to
 “ *Governors* also, as to those who are *sent by him*, that
 “ is, who are commissioned by the King ——— But
 “ here we may observe farther, that this Command was
 “ laid upon all Christians, when there was never a
 “ Christian King or Governor in the World, but were
 “ all rather inveterate Enemies to Christianity itself,
 “ and endeavoured all they could to destroy and banish
 “ it out of the World, yet for all that, all Christians
 “ are here commanded to submit to them. Which
 “ shews that the Duty is to be performed to the King,
 “ as such: Not because he is a Christian, a just, a
 “ merciful King, but because he is a King authorized
 “ by God to rule and govern us.

“ This, says (a) Dr. Kennet Dean of *Peterburgh*, is
 “ the true foundation of that common Axiom, *the King*
 “ *can do no wrong*, because there is no Right and Re-
 “ medy against his Royal Person.” Mr. Dean also in-
 “ forms us farther, (b) “ That the Statute, 12. *Char. II.*
 “ *chap. 30. 7.* which utterly condemns all Pretence to
 “ a coercive Power over our Sovereign, was no inno-
 “ vation, but was declarative of our ORIGINAL
 “ CONSTITUTION.

But I know none has urged this Duty more home, or
 guarded more carefully against all Evasions, or what-
 soever Pretences for the breach of it, than Dr. *Manning-*
ham the present Lord Bishop of *Chichester*. Who in
 (c) a Sermon preached at the *Rolls*, Jan. 30 and licen-

N 3

sed

(a) In the Margin of his Sermon preached before the House
 of Commons, Jan. 30. 1705-6.

(b) Ibid. (c) P. 20, 21.

fed Feb. 8. 1685-6. assures his Auditory, " That the
 " Unlawfulness of RESISTANCE IN ANY CASE,
 " AND UPON ANY PRETENCE WHATSOEVER,
 " EVER, either *Popish* or *Fanatick*, has been so strongly
 " ly asserted, and so fully ~~Evidenced~~^{convinc'd} through all the
 " Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, through
 " the Histories, Examples, Apologies of the Primitive
 " Times, by unanswerable positive Reasons, by a removal of all imaginable Objections, and by the
 " Convictions of former and late Experience, that no
 " Man can for the future be a Rebel in this Nation,
 " without being either a HYPOCRITE or an
 " ATHEIST. Thus, says his Lordship, you see with
 " what Conscience, Learning, Industry, and Persuasion, the *Church of England* has endeavoured to dispel
 " all the Mists of former Darkness, to take away all
 " Materials for Sedition, and to make all her Members
 " Religious, Wise and Peaceable.

" There had been, says the Lord Bishop of *Exon*,
 " (a) long before *S. Paul* wrote his Epistle to the *Romans*, — many cruel Tyrants, and Monsters of
 " Men, in possession of the Highest Power; there had
 " been one — before, and yet not very long before that time, of whom the *Historian* relates this
 " Passage, That he wish'd all the Citizens of *Rome* had
 " but one Neck, that he might dispatch 'em all at
 " one blow; and yet not one Word do we meet with
 " in *S. Paul*, or any other *Apostle*, serving to instruct
 " Subjects in the Natural Right, that they had in such
 " Cases, to defend themselves by Resistance; much less
 " to Depose, Judge, Punish, — or to Neck, or Behead their Sovereign: Nothing but *let every soul be*
 " *subject to the Higher Powers; ye must needs be subject,*
 " *not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake, &c.*

" I am strongly inclined, says the ingenious and learned *Dr. Mosß*, to think (b) that if that known Passage,
 " in the thirteenth to the *Romans*, had been suffered to
 " stand

(a) Answer to Mr. Hoadly's Letter. p. 29.

(b) Sermon before the House of Commons, Jan. 30. 1706.

“ stand by itself, unincumbered with all strange Glos-
 “ ses ; and had it been only considered when, and to
 “ whom the Injunction was given, and in what solemn
 “ manner, no Mortal could ever have dreamt that it
 “ should ever infer any Licence, much less imply an
 “ Obligation of Resisting the Supreme Magistrate,
 “ with Violence and Outrage, and Persecuting him
 “ even to the Death. One would think too, if that
 “ Text did stand in any need of Explication, that the
 “ universal Practice of the Primitive Christians, the
 “ constant Judgment of the ancient Fathers, the express
 “ Doctrine of our received Homilies, and the Consent
 “ of all the best and most learned Interpreters, should
 “ be more likely to lead into the true Meaning of it,
 “ than the perverse Comments of a *Mariana*, or a *Dole-*
 “ *man*, or any other Parasite, or Asserter of his exter-
 “ minating Power over Princes ; I add, or a *Junius*
 “ *Brutus*, a *Knox*, or *Buchanan*, or any *Sheba* blowing
 “ a Trumpet of Rebellion in our Land.

† *Th.*

Dr. *Sacheverel* in his well known (a) Sermon, about
Perils from false Brethren, speaks thus. “ The Grand
 “ Security of our Government, and the very Pillar upon
 “ which it stands, is founded upon the steady Belief of
 “ the Subjects Obligation to an absolute and uncon-
 “ ditional Obedience to the Supreme Power, in all
 “ things Lawful, and the utter *Illegality* of *Resistance*
 “ upon any Pretence whatsoever.

Mr. *Milbourn* justly (b) terms these *Antiscriptural*
 Doctrines ; “ That the Original of all Power is from the
 “ People ; that lawful Princes are accountable to, and punish-
 “ able and deposable by their own Subjects ; that if the Prince
 “ fails in his Duty, the Subjects are immediately discharged
 “ from theirs, &c.” And speaking of S. Paul’s Appeal
 from *Festus* to *Nero*, draws this Inference from it ;
 (c) “ This Action of S. Paul may serve to explain his
 “ Meaning when he commands, *Rom. 13. 1. Every soul*

N 4

to

(a) Preached at S. Paul’s Nov. 5. 1709.

(b) Sermon on Jan. 30. 1708.

(c) *Melius inquirendum. p. 13.*

“ to be subject to the Higher Powers ; which he does, not
 “ because they were good or bad Men, just or unjust
 “ in discharging their Duties, but because they were or-
 “ dained of God. He, who had made David, a Man after
 “ God’s own Heart, King of all Israel, made Jeroboam,
 “ the Man that taught Israel to sin, King over the re-
 “ volted Tribes. He, who made Josiah King of Judah,
 “ had made his Father Amon so before him. He, who
 “ anointed Cyrus King of Persia, made the barbarous
 “ Cambyzes his Successor. He, who made Augustus,
 “ Vespasian, Trajan, the Antonines, Alexander Severus,
 “ Constantine, Theodosius first and second, Emperors of
 “ Rome ; raised Caligula, Nero, Domitian, Commodus,
 “ Maximin, Dioclesian, Julian, Phocas, Monsters of
 “ Men, to the same Dignity. And indeed, let those
 “ who are our lawful and rightful Governors, be good or
 “ bad, as to their personal Qualifications, they are not
 “ Terrours to good Works, but to the evil ; for who can
 “ harm us, if we be doers of that which is good ? is S. Peter’s
 “ Question. But the worst of Princes will be still a
 “ Terrour to evil-doers. For tho’ some vicious Persons
 “ may be Favourites to a lawful Prince, who governs
 “ tyrannically ; yet there never was such a Tyrant in
 “ the World, who did not, by his Laws, and by the
 “ Ministry of his Substitutes, bring abundance of real
 “ Malefactors to condign Punishment ; and their very Fa-
 “ vourites, tho’ in the Bosoms of their Masters, are in
 “ as dangerous a condition, as the worst of Men are
 “ under the best of Governors. How, therefore, we
 “ ought to behave ourselves under the worst of Gover-
 “ nors, S. Paul teaches us by his own Example ; for he,
 “ under the immediate Conduct of the Holy Spirit,
 “ appeal’d to Nero Caesar, as wicked as he was, which
 “ he would never have done, had it not been just and
 “ agreeable to the Will of God.” Again, (a) “ The
 “ Sovereign, or Supreme Power in all Governments, must
 “ be Absolute, Arbitrary, above all Coercion ; other-
 “ wise, no inconvenient, no unjust Laws, can ever be
 “ amended

“ amended or repealed.” And particularly as to our Constitution he observes, “ That (a) our *written Laws* declare the Kingdom of England a Monarchy, an Empire; the Crown of England independent, imperial, and from God only. They declare that there is no Power coordinate with, nor coercive over him; and that every Attempt to *coerce him*, to raise Arms against him, to *Disinherit him*, is *High Treason*, &c.” (b) “ It has been long thought, by very good Men, that this Chapter [Rom. 13.] teaches us, that all *lawful Magistrates are the Ordinance of God*, and that they have their Commission from Him; and it looks very like Truth, and such Truth as even the Heathen World, by their weaker Light, had discovered, tho’ an Apostle, inspired by the Holy Ghost had not asserted it. But when S. Paul tells us, in as express Words as possible, That the Powers that be, are ordained of God; and that they who Resist them, Resist the Ordinance of God; and as a Reward for their Resistance, shall receive to themselves Damnation; one would have thought that Doctrine should have been rendred Authentick, at least among Christians.” And a little after; “ If the Christians were Doers of Good, (c) were the Emperors Terrours to good Works, or to the Evil, when they persecuted the Christians, since they did it as Magistrates in the Execution of their Office, and according to the known Laws of the Empire? Yet these very Christians, were the Persons whom the Apostle commanded to be subject to the Higher Powers, and assures them that if they Resisted these Powers, they Resisted the Ordinance of God, and should receive to themselves Damnation.” With a great deal more to the same purpose, both in that same Sermon, and his other since entituled *The Impiety and Folly of Resisting Lawful Governors by Force or Arms*.

“ I confess, (d) says Dr. Welton, I much wonder, not from what Assurance, but from what Pretence or
“ Colour,

(a) P. 19.

(b) *Measures of Resistance*. p. 3.

(c) P. 9.

(d) *Sermon before the Lieutenancy of London*, Nov. 19. 1710.

“ Colour, these Gentlemen of Latitude can attempt to
 “ evade, and act in open Defiance to all those Threats,
 “ Commands, and Obligations, that are so express in
 “ the thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans*: 'Tis a plain
 “ case, that however they may endeavour to wrest the
 “ Precepts laid down there to their own pernicious and
 “ destructive Purposes, the truth of the matter is, they
 “ must have renounced the Notions of a God, a Con-
 “ science, and a future State; they must have exchange'd
 “ the Everlasting Truths of Religion and Order, for
 “ those dear purchas'd Contradictions of Anarchy and
 “ Democracy, over-balancing Right and Justice only
 “ with the weight of some sordid Interest, some *filthy*
 “ *Lucre*; else they could never be thus led by Principle,
 “ as they are, to Insult their Prince, Blaspheme Author-
 “ rity, Defy Religion, and Trample upon all Right
 “ and Duty. Can any positive Command in nature
 “ be more plain, than that which is so literally en-
 “ joined by these Words? *Let every Soul be subject to*
 “ *the Higher Powers; the Powers that be, are ordained of*
 “ *God: Therefore we must needs be subject for Conscience*
 “ *sake: For they that Resist, shall receive to themselves*
 “ *Damnation.* ——— (a) Where the Commands of
 “ Princes are lawful, we are bound by our Principles
 “ to an Active Obedience. This admits of no Scruple,
 “ or Debate; *Ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath,*
 “ *but also for Conscience sake:* This engages us upon all
 “ Occasions to submit our private Judgment to Publick
 “ Authority, where it is not evident from the Word of
 “ God, that it's contrary to our Duty; and in all
 “ things to stand by and defend their sacred Characters
 “ and Persons, from the Insolencies and Attempts of
 “ those that dare to oppose them. And where their
 “ Commands are really unlawful, we must submit and
 “ yield a Passive Obedience unto them; we must not
 “ otherwise *wistand* them, than by our Prayers and
 “ Tears, and so far we may be said to *wistand*, and
 “ no farther. ——— (b) We know, and do believe
 that

“ that *there is no rising up against the King*, Prov. 30. 31.
 “ There is no Power given or allow'd from God unto
 “ the People, to Coerce, or to Try or Judge their
 “ Prince, but to keep his Command, and to observe
 “ his Pleasure in things lawful, and to undergo Penal-
 “ ty where they are not so.

The Lord Bishop of *Bristol* speaking of *David*, (a) has
 this Observation concerning him. “ He could not
 “ but know that his EXEMPTION FROM ANY
 “ EARTHLY COERCION, by leaving him so much
 “ in the Counsel of his own Will, exposed him to the
 “ Danger of being led into Errour and Mistakes.”
 Where his Lordship evidently takes it for granted, as
 an undoubted Truth, that King *David* was, and by
 consequence all Sovereign Princes are, *exempt from all*
earthly Coercion.

To the same purpose speaks Mr. *Blomer*. (b) “ The
 “ Supreme Magistrate, if he will act justly and reason-
 “ ably, must govern according to Law ; for he has
 “ solemnly Sworn to do so. If, in spite of all Obli-
 “ gations, he will take upon him to act arbitrarily and
 “ illegally, and to oppress and enslave the People com-
 “ mitted to his Charge ; his Person indeed is Sacred,
 “ for he is the Lord's Anointed ; *And who may say unto*
 “ *Him*, What dost Thou ?

But I shall not stand to heap up particular Instances
 of this nature, though the Sermons and other Writings
 of the *English* Clergy afford good store of them ; but
 leaving the several Members, shall proceed to the Church
 itself, to shew that her own avowed Doctrine as taught
 in the Book of Homilies, set forth by Authority, and
 appointed to be read in Churches, is so full and express
 in favour of the Doctrine of Non-resistance, that no-
 thing can be more so ; and this not only by the by, and
 in some casual or accidental Passage, that perhaps
 might be streined beyond the Design of the Compilers,
 but studiously and industriously, as the Aim and End
 of

(a) *Sermon at S. James's, March 8. 1710.*

(b) *Sermon in King Henry VII's Chappel, March 8. 1710.*

of the Discourse, and which is in no wise to be avoided; but by Mr. H.'s way of interpreting, that is, by putting a contrary Sence to what was intended, upon the Words, and which they can by no means bear.

Here therefore it is the undoubted Doctrine of our Church, That (a) We must refer all Judgment to GOD, to Kings and Rulers, Judges under them, which be GOD's Officers to execute Justice, and by plain Words of Scripture, have their Authority, and use of the Sword granted from GOD, as we are taught by S. Paul, that dear and chosen Apostle of our Saviour Christ, whom we ought diligently to obey, even as we would obey our Saviour Christ, if he were present. Thus S. Paul writeth to the Romans, Let every soul submit himself unto the authority of the Higher Powers, for there is no power but of GOD. The powers that be are ordained of GOD. Whosoever therefore withstandeth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of GOD; but they that resist, or are against it, shall receive to themselves Damnation. For Rulers are not fearful to them that do good, but to them that do evil. Wilt thou then be without fear of that Power? Do well then, so shalt thou be praised for the same, for he is the Minister of GOD for thy wealth. But, and if thou do that which is evil, then fear, for he beareth not the Sword for nought, for he is the Minister of GOD, to take vengeance on him that doth evil. Wherefore ye must needs obey, not only for fear of vengeance, but also, because of conscience, and even for this cause pay you tribute, for they are GOD's Ministers serving for the same purpose. Here let us learn of S. Paul, the chosen vessel of GOD, that all persons having souls (he excepted none, nor exempteth none, neither Priest, Apostle, nor Prophet, saith S. Chrysostom) do owe of bounden duty, and even in conscience, obedience, submission, and subjection, to the High Powers, which be set in authority by GOD,

for as

forasmuch as they be GOD's Lieutenants, GOD's Officers, GOD's Commissioners, GOD's Judges, ordained of GOD himself, of whom only they have all their power, and all their authority. And the same S. Paul threateneth no less pain, than everlasting Damnation to all disobedient persons, to all resisters against this general, and common authority, forasmuch as they resist not man but GOD; nor man's device, and invention, but GOD's Wisdom, GOD's Order, Power, and Authority. — (a) And here, (good people) let us all mark diligently, that it is not lawful for inferiours, and subjects, in any case to resist, and stand against the superiour Powers; for S. Paul's words be plain, that whosoever withstandeth, withstandeth the ordinance of GOD. Our Saviour Christ himself, and his Apostles, received many, and divers injuries of the unfaithful, and wicked men in authority; yet we never read that they, or any of them, caused any sedition, or rebellion against authority. — They knew that the authority of the Powers was GOD's ordinance, and therefore both in their words, and deeds, they taught ever obedience to it, and never taught nor did the contrary. The wicked Judge Pilate said to Christ, Knowest thou not, that I have power to crucify thee, and have power also to loose thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above. Whereby Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked Rulers have their power, and authority from GOD, and therefore it is not lawful for their subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their power. — The holy Apostle Peter commandeth servants to be obedient to their Masters, not only if they be good, and gentle, but also if they be evil, and froward; affirming that the vocation, and calling of GOD's people, is to be patient, and of the suffering side. And there he bringeth in the patience of our Saviour Christ,

Christ, to perswade obedience to Governours, yea, although they be wicked, and wrong doers.

(a) Holy David also teaches us a good lesson in this behalf, who was many times most cruelly, and wrongfully persecuted by King Saul, and many times also put in jeopardy, and danger of his life by King Saul, and his people, yet he neither withstood, nor used any force or violence against King Saul, his mortal and deadly enemy, but did ever to his liege Lord, and master, King Saul, most true, most diligent, and most faithful service, with more to the same purpose. Whereupon it follows; Here is evidently proved, that we may not withstand, nor in anywise hurt an anointed King, which is GOD's Lieutenant, Vicegerent, and highest Minister in that country where he is King. But peradventure some here would say, that David here in his own defence might have killed King Saul lawfully, and with a safe conscience. But holy David did know that he might in no wise withstand, hurt, or kill his sovereign Lord and King: he did know he was but King Saul's subject, though he were in great favour with GOD, and his enemy King Saul out of GOD's favour. Therefore though he were never so much provoked, yet he refuseth utterly to hurt the Lord's anointed. He durst not for offending GOD, and his own conscience, (although he had occasion and opportunity) once lay his hands upon GOD's high Officer, the King, whom he did know to be a person reserved, and kept (for his Office sake) only to GOD's punishment and judgment.

(b) By these two Examples S. David (being named in Scripture a man after GOD's own heart) giveth a general rule and lesson to all subjects in the world, not to withstand their liege Lord, and King, not to take a sword by their private authority against their King, GOD's anointed, who only beareth the sword by GOD's authority for the maintenance of the good; and for the punishment of the evil; who only by GOD's Law

Law hath the use of the sword at his command, and also hath all power, jurisdiction, regiment, correction, and punishment, as supreme Governour of all his Realms and Dominions, and that even by the authority of GOD, and by GOD's Ordinances. Then follows an account of the *Amalekite*, who had killed *Saul*, and the unexpected return he met with from *David* for it. Whence again it is inferred, That it is an intolerable ignorance, madness, and wickedness, for subjects to make any murmuring, rebellion, resistance, or withstanding, commotion, or insurrection against their most dear, and most dread sovereign Lord, and King, ordained, and appointed of GOD's goodness for their commodity, peace, and quietness. Yet let us believe ——— that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other ——— if they would command us to do any thing contrary to GOD's Commandments. ——— But nevertheless in that case we may not in any wise withstand violently, or rebell against Rulers, or make any insurrection, sedition, or tumults, either by force of arms or otherwise against the anointed of the Lord, or any of his officers; but we must in such case patiently suffer all wrongs, and injuries, referring the judgment of our cause only to GOD. ——— (a) The violence and injury that is committed against authority, is committed against GOD, the Commonwealth, and the whole Realm; which God will have known, and condignly and worthily punished one way or other. ——— Therefore let us all fear the most detestable vice of rebellion, ever knowing, and remembering, that he that resisteth or withstandeth common authority, resisteth, or withstandeth GOD, and his Ordinance, as it may be proved by many other more places of Scripture. ——— (b) This is GOD's Ordinance, GOD's Commandment, and GOD's Holy Will, that the whole body of every Realm, and all the members,

and

(a) Last part of the same Sermon. p. 75.

(b) P. 77.

and parts of the same, shall be subject to their Head, their King, and that (as S. Peter writeth) for the Lord's sake : and (as S. Paul writeth) for conscience sake, and not for fear only.

Thus plain and peremptory is this Homily against all Resistance of our lawful Superiours, whether faithful and upright in the discharge of their Office, or such as grossly neglect and contradict the End and Design of it. It teaches that Kings have their Authority from God, and are his Lieutenants, Vicegerents, Commissioners, and Judges ; that the Sword belongs to them alone, as committed to them by God ; that to Resist them, is to Resist not Man but God, not Man's Invention, but God's Wisdom, God's Order, Power, and Authority ; that it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects in any case to resist and stand against the superiour Powers ; that even wicked Rulers have their Power and Authority from God, and it is not lawful for their Subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their Power ; and though they command any thing unlawful, though they are not to be obeyed herein ; yet nevertheless in that case, we may not in any wise withstand Violently, or Rebell against such Rulers, or make any Inturfection, or Tumults, but must patiently suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the Judgment of our Cause to God only. This is the Sum of what I have cited out of this *Homily of Obedience* ; and it so plainly and positively condemns all violent and forcible Opposition to the *Higher Powers*, that Mr. H. must have very good luck, if he can make all this be spoken in favour of Resistance.

And again this same Church of ours teaches (a) That in reading of the Holy Scriptures, we shall find in very many, and almost infinite places, as well of the Old Testament, as of the New, that Kings and Princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by GOD's Ordinance, and that Subjects are bound to obey

(a) *Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion.*
p. 276.

obey them. And then (a) it argues from *Rom. 13*: and *1 S. Pet. 2.* repeating what is there taught as to this point, by the two great Apostles *S. Paul* and *S. Peter*. Then it follows, It is most evident that ——— such Subjects as are disobedient or rebellious against their Princes, disobey GOD, and procure their own damnation; and that if Servants ought to obey their Masters, not only being gentle, but such as be forward; as well and much more ought Subjects to be obedient, not only to their good, and courteous, but also to their sharp, and rigorous Princes. ———

(b) What shall Subjects do then? Shall they obey valiant, stout, wise, and good Princes, and condemn, disobey, and rebell against children being their Princes, or against indiscreet, and evil Governors? God forbid: For first what a perillous thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the judgement, which Prince is wise, and godly, and his government good, and which is otherwise? as though the foot must judge of the head, an enterprise very heinous, and must needs breed rebellion. For who else be they that are most inclined to rebellion, but such haughty spirits? From whom springeth such foul ruin of Realms? Is not Rebellion the greatest of all mischiefs? And who are most ready to the greatest mischiefs, but the worst men? Rebels therefore the worst of all Subjects, are most ready to rebellion, as being the worst of all vices, and farthest from the duty of a good Subject. ———

What an unworthy matter were it then, to make the naughtiest Subjects, and most enclining to rebellion, and all evil, judges over their Princes, &c. ——— Whereas indeed a Rebel is worse than the worst Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst Prince that hitherto hath been: both Rebels are unmeet ministers, and Rebellion an unfit, and unwholsom medicine to reform any small lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little
O
grievs

grievs in government, such lewd remedies being far worse than any other maladies and disorders, that can be in the body of a Commonwealth. But whatsoever the Prince be, or his Government, it is evident that for the most part, those Princes, whom some Subjects do think to be very goodly, and under whose government they rejoyce to live; some other Subjects do take the same to be evil, and ungodly, and do wish for a change. If therefore all Subjects that mis-like of their Prince, should rebell, no Realm should ever be without rebellion. — (a) But what if the Prince be indiscreet, and evil indeed, and is also evident to all mens eyes that he is so? I ask again, What if it be long of the wickedness of the Subjects that the Prince is indiscreet and evil? Shall the Subjects both by their wickedness provoke GOD for their deserved punishment, to give them an indiscreet, or evil Prince, and also rebell against him, and withall against GOD, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a Prince? &c. — Here you see GOD placeth as well evil Princes as good, and for what cause he doth both. — For Subjects to deserve through their sins to have an evil Prince, and then to rebell against him, were double, and treble evil, by provoking GOD more to plague them. — Who, I pray you, was Prince over the most part of the Christians, when GOD's Holy Spirit by S. Paul gave them this lesson? Forsooth Caligula, Claudius, or Nero; who were not only no Christians, but Pagans, and also either foolish Rulers, or most cruel (b) tyrants. — Thus far the Prophet Baruch his words; which are spoken by him unto the people of GOD, of that King who was an heathen, a tyrant, a cruel oppressor of them, and had been a murderer of many thousands of their Nation, and a despoiler of their Country, with a confession that their sins had deserved such a Prince to reign over them. And shall the old Christians by S. Paul's

S. Paul's exhortation, pray for Caligula, Claudius, or Nero? Shall the Jews pray for Nebuchodonosor? These Emperors and Kings being strangers unto them, being Pagans, and Infidels, being murthe-
 rers, tyrants, and cruel oppressors of them, and
 destroyers of their Country, countrymen, and kins-
 men, the burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities,
 and Temples? And shall not we pray for the long,
 prosperous, and godly reign of our Natural Prince?

In the second part of this Homily we have *David's*
 behaviour towards his Sovereign King *Saul* propounded
 to us at large for our loyal Imitation, together with
 some argumentative Questions and Answers arising from
 it, whereby the more effectually to press upon all Sub-
 jects a due Allegiance and Submission to their unjust,
 wicked, and tyrannical Princes. But the main of this
 being set down in the former part of this Discourse (a),
 I pass it over at present, as being what the Reader may
 find there, if he shall please to cast his eye back to it.
 Which if he do, he will quickly see that I have not
 sought to impose upon him, by telling him that our
 Church has taken occasion from this illustrious Example
 of good *David*, to recommend a steady Subjection, and
 a quiet and passive Obedience even to tyrannical and
 cruel Princes, much more to such as are careless and
 negligent, and do only *not attend to the End and Design*
of their Institution, and the high Office and great Power
 with which they are entrusted by God.

To this also is subjoined the Instance of the blessed
 Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Saviour Christ,
 who upon *Augustus's* Command to the *Jews* that every one
 should repair to his own Home to be taxed there, though
 highly in God's favour, though of the Blood Royal of the
 ancient Kings of *Jury*, and though not only great with
 Child, and near the time of Delivery, and so very un-
 fit to take a Journey, and especially at that time of the
 year; the very middle and sharpest of the Winter, and
 though besides she could expect but very indifferent

Accommodations when come thither, by reason of the mighty Concourſe that might be expected upon ſuch an occaſion, eſpecially for one in her condition, yet notwithstanding all theſe Impediments, She did not diſdain to obey the commandment of an heathen, and foreign Prince, when GOD had placed ſuch one over them. — (a) This Obedience, ſays the Homily, of this moſt noble, and moſt vertuous Lady, to a foreign and Pagan Prince, doth well teach us (who in compariſon of her are moſt baſe, and vile) what ready obedience we do owe to our natural, and gracious Sovereign.

If this be not enough to ſatisfy us that our Church is for Obedience to heathen and unreaſonable Princes, and ſuch as do not duly conſult their People's Welfare, let us look forward a little farther, and we ſhall have the moſt encouraging and inviting Inſtance of Patience and Submission the World ever had, and which muſt inevitably leave all thoſe utterly inexcusable that do not ſtudiously and courageouſly endeavour to be conformed to it; I mean that of our ever bleſſed Saviour. Who as he was in himſelf of infinitely greater Dignity than the greateſt Emperor that ever was, ſo were his Sufferings the moſt unjuſt that could be, and yet were in that Extremity, that they needed a more than human Strength and Patience for enduring them. And it is therefore moſt certain, (b) No example ought to be of more force with us Chriſtians, than the example of Chriſt, our maſter and ſaviour, who though he were the Son of GOD, yet did always behave himſelf moſt reverently to ſuch men as were in authority in the World in his time, and he not rebelliouſly behaved himſelf, but openly did teach the Jews to pay Tribute to the Roman Emperor, — and being brought before Pontius Pilate, a ſtranger born, and a heathen man, being Lord Preſident of Jury, he acknowledged his authority and power to be given him from GOD, and obeyed patiently the ſentence

sentence of most painful and shameful death, which the said Judge pronounced, and gave most unjustly against him, without any grudge, murmuring, or evil word once giving.

Besides which we are also told, (a) There be many and divers other examples of the Obedience to Princes, even such as be evil, in the New Testament, to the utter confusion of disobedient, and rebellious people, but this one may be an eternal example, which the Son of GOD, and so the Lord of all, Jesus Christ hath given to us his Christians, and servants, and such as may serve for all, to teach us to obey Princes, though strangers, wicked and wrongful, when GOD for our sins shall place such over us.

The whole Aim of the third part of this Homily is to shew, (b) What an abominable sin against GOD, and man Rebellion is, and how dreadfully the wrath of GOD is kindled and enflamed against all Rebels, and what horrible plagues, punishments, and deaths, and finally eternal Damnation doth hang over their heads: as how on the contrary, good, and obedient Subjects are in GOD's favour, and be partakers of peace, quietness, and security, with other GOD's manifold blessings in this World, and by his mercy through our Saviour Christ, of life everlasting also in the World to come. The former of which Propositions is closely pursued, and Rebellion proved to be highly offensive to Almighty God, inasmuch as one way or other it occasions the transgression of all his Commandments, and dangerous and destructive to the Communities where it happens, none being secure there of their Liberties, Estates, or Lives, and nothing but Rapine, Confusion, and Disorders, and all sorts of Cruelty and Injustice to be expected; and lastly as to the Rebels themselves, that whilst they are in this World, they live in Shame and Infamy, and under the Tortures of a guilty stinging Conscience, and justly do fall headlong into hell when they dye.

The next part of the Homily propounds to shew some Scripture-Examples of Rebels against their Princes, and the condign Punishment they met with for it. And here is observed how (a) Some of the children of Israel, being murmurers against their Magistrates appointed over them by GOD, were stricken with foul leprosy: many were burnt up with fire suddenly sent from the Lord: sometime a great sort of thousands were consumed with pestilence: sometime they were stinged to death with a strange kind of fiery serpents: and — some of the captains with their band of murmurers, not dying by any usual or natural death of men, but the earth opening, they with their wives, children, and families, were swallowed quick down into Hell. And presently after comes this Inference, If such strange and horrible plagues did fall upon such Subjects as did only murmur, and speak evil against their heads; what shall become of those most wicked imps of the devil that do conspire, arm themselves, assemble great numbers of armed rebels, and lead them with them against their Prince, and Country, spoiling and robbing, killing and murdering all good Subjects that do withstand them, as many as they may prevail against: What Punishment of their Wickedness such are to expect is farther intimated in the case of *Abshalom*, who got his Death by rising against his Father and Sovereign; of *Achitophel*, who became his Accomplice and Adviser in this undutiful Attempt, and (b) for lack of an Hangman, a convenient servitor for such a Traitor, went, and hanged up himself; of *Seba*, who lost his Head in *Abel*, where he thought to have secured himself; and of the five Kings who rose up against *Chedorlaomer*, (c) unto whom they had promised loyalty and obedience. The like disappointment, we are here taught, is also to be expected by others, whatever fair Pleas they may make for their Resistance; and though they should pretend sundry causes, as the
redress

(a) P. 299.

(b) P. 300.

(c) P. 301.

redress of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of all other mischiefs doth most destroy) or reformation of Religion, though they have made a great shew of holy meaning, by beginning their rebellions with a counterfeited service of GOD, (as did wicked Absolon begin his Rebellion with sacrificing unto GOD) though they display, and bear about ensigns, and banners, which are acceptable to the rude, ignorant common people, great multitudes of whom by such false pretences, and shews they do deceive, and draw unto them; yet — the speedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what number, state, or condition soever they were, or what colour or cause soever they pretended, is, and ever hath been such, that GOD thereby doth shew that he alloweth neither the dignity of any person, nor the multitude of any people, nor the weight of any cause, as sufficient for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion against their Princes. The two common Pretences for all Attempts of this nature are said to be (a) Religion, and the Redress of the Commonwealth. And as to both these it is argued, that it must be a very indifferent sort of Religion such Men by such means would restore, even as good a Religion surely, as Rebels be good men, and obedient subjects, and as Rebellion is a good mean of redress and reformation, being itself the greatest deformation of all that may possible be; and concerning pretences of any redress of the Commonwealth, made by Rebels, every man that hath but half an eye, may see how vain they be, Rebellion being, as I have before declared, the greatest ruin, and destruction of all Commonwealths that may be possible. Though many causes of Rebellion, saith the fifth part, (b) may be reckoned, and almost as many as there be vices in men and women, as hath been before noted; yet — the

O 4

most

(a) P. 302.

(b) P. 307.

most usual causes are these two, Ambition and Ignorance. By Ambition is meant, the unlawful, and restless desire in men, to be of higher estate than GOD hath given or appointed unto them. By Ignorance is meant, no unskillfulness in Arts or Sciences, but the lack of knowledge of GOD's blessed Will declared in his holy Word, which teacheth both extremely to abhor all Rebellion, as being the root of all mischief, and specially to delight in Obedience, as the beginning and foundation of all goodness, as hath been also before specified. The former of these is particularly argued against through the remainder of this part of the Homily, and is especially applied to the Pope and Church of *Rome*. The other, is the subject of the last part of the Homily; and the *Popes of Rome* are charged with having made great use of the Peoples Ignorance, for disturbing and subjecting to themselves this Realm of *England*. All which I let pass, as of less concern to us in this present Controversy.

Thus I have shewn the Judgment of our Church in this Point, not only from the Sayings of its Prelates, and others of the Inferiour Clergy, from time to time, condemning all Resistance of the Higher Powers, as contrary to the Laws of our Religion, and a ready way to everlasting Destruction; but likewise from the Doctrine of the Church's Homilies, declaring the use of the Sword to be committed by God to the Magistrate, and not therefore to be taken up by any without his order; and therefore by no means to be used against himself: That to withstand him, is to withstand God's Ordinance, and incur the Penalty of Damnation: That Sovereign Princes are God's Lieutenants, and Officers; and Obedience is due to them not only for fear of Punishment from them, but out of Conscience, and as we would not offend Almighty God, whose Officers and Lieutenants they are; professing, that it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects, *IN ANY CASE*, to resist and stand against the Superiour Powers; recommending good *David's Example*, who would upon no Provocation be

prevailed with to behave himself otherwise towards King *Saul*, than as became a dutiful and obedient Subject; condemning all murmuring disrespectful Language towards our Superiours, much more all Resistance, all Commotions, Insurrections, and Rebellions; and teaching rather, *patiently to suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the Judgment of our Cause to God only*: affirming bad, as well as good Princes, to reign by God only; and stigmatizing Rebellion, *as the greatest of all Mischiefs*, and Rebels *as the worst of Subjects, and of Men, worse than the worst of Princes*; and their Rebellion, *as worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince that hitherto hath been*; noting withal the principal Causes of, and Motives to Rebellion, and the heavy Judgments God has inflicted upon such as were guilty of it in this World, besides everlasting Torments denounced against them in the next.

And could it have been thought after this, that Non-resistance should not be allow'd to be the Doctrine of our Church? Could it have been imagined, that any Man of common Sense, who had read these Passages which I have here recited, and those abundantly more refer'd to in the History of Passive Obedience, could ever conceive the Doctrine of Resistance to be the Doctrine of our Divines and Homilies? Or that Passive Obedience is not here as expressly taught as may be? Yet Mr. *H.* it seems cannot find it to be so. It is not for the Reputation of his Scheme, that it should appear contradictory to the avowed Doctrine of the Church whereof he is a Minister; and therefore it is not to be thought the Church can ever have avowed such a Doctrine, though her Words are as plain, and as incapable of any other Interpretation as can be. To this therefore Mr. *H.* returns Answer, first as to the Judgment of our Divines, and then as to the Homilies.

1. As to the Judgment of our Divines, He is (a) *heartily sorry it should be found to be so*, that is, that his Doctrine and theirs should not agree: But his comfort

fort is, *this can never prove any thing against the truth of what he has undertaken to maintain. For there was a time, in which any one who should have spoken against Transubstantiation, and many other absurd Opinions, would have had the same sort of Objection made against him. Very true ! There was a Time, when the Nation was overrun with Popery and its Errors. But it is an odd consequence from hence, that because divers Errors had for some time been generally maintained, apparently contrary to Scripture, and the Doctrines and Practices of the Primitive Church, therefore there is no regard to be had to the Judgment of those who have shaken off these Errors, and have both the Scripture and all the purest Antiquity on their Side ; as I have fully shewn our Divines to have in this Case. He adds, And since the Reformation there was as universal a Consent against the Lawfulness of all Usury, as there can be produced against the Lawfulness of all Resistance. But what Proof does Mr. H. give of this ? Has he as large a Catalogue of the Writers against Usury, as the History of Passive Obedience presents him with against Resistance ? If he has, I must own his Objection to be of Force : But till that be done, I hope he will not require such an Assertion to be assented to purely upon his Word for it. That Bishop (b) Andrews, and several others were against all manner of Usury, and that amongst them, Bishop Sander-son declaims rather than argues against it, I readily grant ; but that at any time since the Reformation there was such an universal Consent against it, as has been proved to have been against Resistance, is not so very evident : I am sure Mr. H. has said nothing to prove there was ; and till he shall prove it, I am not bound to concern myself with his bare Affirmation. He proceeds : But indeed there is no Argument more destructive to Truth, and the Cause of True Religion, than that taken from Authority, which if once it be admitted in one Case, must be admitted so far in others, as for ever to ruin*

(b) De usuris Theolog. Determinat.

(c) Serm. on 1 Cor. 7. 24. v. 31.

ruine the Cause of Truth and Goodness in the World. Yet after all, it is very certain, that the consentient Judgment of the most Eminent and Learned Divines of any Church, are next to its publick Declarations of whatever Sort, whether by way of Article, of Homily, or Catechism, or howsoever else; next to these, I say, the consentient Judgment of the generality of its Divines, and especially of the Principal and most Eminent of them, is the best Evidence of a Church's Doctrine; which whosoever professes himself a Member of, much more a Priest and Minister of that Church, will not readily find himself at liberty to depart from, whilst he continues such. And to prove this, is what their Sayings are cited for. So that Mr. *H.* may censure an Appeal to them, and charge it to be as *unfair and unmanly* as he pleases, yet so long as it answers the Design for which they are appealed to, he will not so easily shake them off.

But now Mr. *H.* comes closer to the Point, and denies the Foundation of this Objection; because *there have been many Divines of the first Rank, in these latter Ages, who have publickly espoused the Doctrine he has taught, or laid down such Principles, as inevitably tend to it.* Of these he names Mr. *Hooker* and Bishop *Bilson*, as Favourers of his Notions: and a little after adds Dr. *Falkener*, and many of the highest Asserters of Non-resistance, who he says, *when they were obliged to speak out upon some Suppositions, do plainly allow of the Lawfulness of Resistance.* No doubt, such as thus allowed the Lawfulness of Resistance, were very high Asserters of Non-resistance. But to let that pass, and the many others he has not thought fit to name, because he could not; let us see what those three he does name say to his Purpose. It is not his manner to tell the Reader in what part of an Author's Works, what he quotes from him is to be found. Instead of this, he leaves him either to take it solely upon his Credit, or else if this do not satisfy, to be at the trouble of turning over and searching till he find it: And thus he has done here; but however that shall not hinder me from following him, as well as I can, where I am left wholly to guess at
what

what Passages in them he refers to. Mr. *Hooker* indeed affirms, (c) that *For any Prince or Potentate, of what kind soever upon Earth, to exercise the same, [the Power of making Laws, to command whole Politick Societies of Men] of himself, and not either by expresse Commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by Authority derived at the first from their Consent, upon whose Persons they impose Laws, it is no better than mere Tyranny.* Whether this be what Mr. *H.* quotes him for, I know not. If it be, I would answer, That Mr. *Hooker* here tells us how a Prince may degenerate into a Tyrant; but does not say that a Tyrant may be lawfully resisted by his People: Which was the only Point that would have been of any Service to Mr. *H.* and his Doctrine of Resistance. I must desire Mr. *H.* also farther to observe, that in the *Clavi Trabales*, published by Dr. *Nicholas Bernard*; where he gives us an account of Mr. *Hooker's* Judgment concerning the King's Power, &c. he concludes that imperfect Discourse of this Great Man with these words: *A Well-spring there is, and a Supreme Head of Justice whereunto all are subject, but itself in subjection to none. Which kind of Preheminence if some ought to have in a Kingdom, who but the King shall have it? Kings therefore no Man can have lawful Power and Authority to judge. If private Men offend, there is the Magistrate over them, which judges; if Magistrates, they have their Prince. If Princes, there is Heaven, a Tribunal before which they shall appear, on Earth they are not accomptable to any; and consequently not resistible.* This is Mr. *Hooker's* Opinion of Resistance. Next comes Bishop *Bilson*; and I must confess Mr. *H.* is not singular in appealing to him, for divers others have taken upon them to do it, before him, and yet what Advantage he will get by it, is past my understanding. (d) For all that he says is, that in those

(c) *Eccles. Polity.* l. i. c. 10. p. 21. (a) P. 94.

(d) *Theophilus.* *The tumults of any Subjects against their Sovereigns, as we do not allow; so may we not condemn the poor afflicted Christians, our neighbours, before we hear them what:*

those Countries where the Constitution is such, as to make the King accountable for his Mismanagement, and by consequence not supreme, he does not condemn the Resistance of such nominal Kings. Now it will puzzle Mr.

what they can say for their defence. Admit them to their answer, and then if their attempts be like yours, or themselves of the same mind that you are, we reject their doings, as hateful before God and man, no less than yours. Your Spanish Inquisitions, and French Massacres, when you murdered men, women, and children, by 1000, and 10000, against the very grounds of all equity, piety, charity, and humanity, without convicting, accusing, or so much as calling before any Judge to hear what was misliked in them, are able to set grave men and good men at their wits ends; and to make them justly doubt, since you refuse the course of all divine and human laws with them, whether by the law of nature they may not defend themselves against such barbarous blood-suckers: yet we stand not on that; if the laws of the land, where they converse, do not permit them to guard their lives, when they are assaulted with unjust force against law; or if they take arms as you do to depose Princes, WE WILL NEVER EXCUSE THEM FROM REBELLION.

Philander. Then they may resist, but we may not. Theo. Your lives are not hunted after—— You mean to deprive Princes, they seek no farther but to defend themselves; not denying to their Princes any tribute, subjection, or honour, which the laws of their Country require:—— These be differences enough between your Wars and theirs; and yet for my part I must confess, that except the laws of those Realms do permit the people to stand on their right, if the Prince would offer that wrong, I DARE NOT ALLOW THEIR ARMS. Phi. What

their laws permit I know not; I am sure in the mean time they resist. Theo. And we, because we do not exactly know

what their laws permit, see no reason to condemn their doings; without hearing their answer. Phi. Think you their laws

permit them to rebell? Theo. I busy not myself in other mens Commonwealths, as you do, neither will I rashly pronounce all that resist to be rebels: Cases may fall out even in Christian Kingdoms, where the people may plead their right against the Prince, and not be charged with Rebellion. Phi. As when

for example? Theo. If a Prince should go about to subject his Kingdom to a foreign Realm, or change the form of the Commonwealth, from impery to tyranny; or neglect the laws
esta-

Mr. H. with all his Ingenuity, to shew what this signifies to our Nation, where the Supremacy is undoubtedly in the Prince. To make our Sovereign accountable for his

established by the common consent of Prince and people, to execute his own pleasures : In these and other cases, which might be named, If the Nobles and Commons join together, to defend their ancient and accustomed liberty, regiment and laws, they may not well be counted rebels. Phi. You denied that even now when I did urge it. Theo. I denied that Bishops had authority to prescribe conditions to Kings when they crowned them ; but I never denied that the people might preserve the foundation, freedom and form of their Commonwealth, which they foreprised, when they first consented to have a King. Phi. I remember you were resolute that subjects might not resist their Princes for any respects, and now I see you slake. Theo. As I said then, so I say now, the law of God giveth no man leave to resist his Prince ; but I never said that Kingdoms and Commonwealths might not proportion their States as they thought best by their publick laws, which afterward the Princes themselves may not violate. By superiour Powers ordained of God, we understand not only Princes, but all politick States and Regiments, somewhere the People, somewhere the Nobles, having the same interest to the Sword, that Princes have in their Kingdoms : and in Kingdoms where Princes bear rule, by the Sword we do not mean the Prince's private will, against his laws ; but his Precept derived from his laws, and agreeing with his laws : which though it be wicked, yet may it not be resisted of any subject with armed violence. Mary, when Princes offer their subjects not justice, but force ; and despise all laws to practise their lusts : not every, nor any private man may take the Sword to redress the Prince ; but if the laws of the Land appoint the Nobles as next to the King to assist him in doing right, and withhold him from doing wrong, then be they licensed by man's law, and so not prohibited by God's, to interpose themselves for the safeguard of equity and innocency ; and by all lawful and needful means to procure the Prince to be reformed, BUT IN NOWISE DEPRIVED, WHERE THE SCEPTER IS INHERITED. Phi. If I should assent to this, how doth it acquit your fellows in Germany, Flanders, France, and Scotland, that resist their Catholick Princes for maintenance of their Heresies ? Theo. Not unless they prove their States to be such as I speak of. The true difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion. Part. III. p. 519, 520, 521.

his Government, because the Kings of *Sparta* and *Hungary* were so, and those of *Poland* are said to be still so, is a Method of Arguing that the Bishop could never be guilty of. Nor is it very just in divers others, as well as Mr. *H.* to charge it upon him. And yet I am sure, without it, all he says signifies nothing to the Point in hand. For here he positively declares, that *unless the Laws of the Land permit them to guard their Lives, when unjustly assaulted, he never will excuse them from Rebellion, and dares not allow their Arms.* And if Mr. *H.* can make this a Plea for resisting any *English* Princes, much good may it do him. But if it be a positive Condemnation of his Doctrine, what can be thought of him, and some others that have trumped up some part of it, as divided from the rest, in favour of illegal Resistance? The best Excuse I can make for them is, that they seemed to have quoted it at second hand, and never looked into the Bishop's Book, to see the Sense and Coherence of what they quoted. The Bishop will not admit the *Spanish* Inquisitions, and *French* Massacres, wherein, to keep to his own Words, *they murdered Men, Women and Children, by Thousands and Ten Thousands, against the very Grounds of all Equity, Piety, Charity, and Humanity; without convicting, accusing, or so much as calling them before any Judge, to hear what was misliked in them;* he will not, I say, admit even these inhuman Proceedings towards Subjects, to be a justifiable Cause of taking up Arms against Law. Which is as odd an Evidence of this Bishop's Approbation of the Resistance Mr. *H.* has taught, and for which he is so strenuous an Advocate, as ever was heard of; there being nothing in all the Bishop says, that is not directly and positively against it. I come now to Dr. *Falkner*, whom Mr. *H.* avows to be of his Side with so much assurance, that I cannot persuade myself he has ever read what the Doctor says upon this Subject. Nay, says Mr. *H.* Dr. *Falkner*, and many of the highest Asserters of Non-resistance, when they are obliged to speak out upon some Suppositions, do plainly allow the Lawfulness of Resistance. His many Assertors of Non-resistance, since he names none of them, I leave to himself. But the Learned Dr. *Falkner* needs to

to have Justice done him against such a groundless Asperſion as this is. He indeed as well as Bp. *Bilſon* hath upon occaſion been repreſented as a Patron of *Reſiſtance*; and now, Mr. *H.* tells, he plainly allows the *Lawfulneſs* of it. Yet he neither gives us his Words, nor mentions the Place where this Allowance is made. But if he means in the ſecond Book of his *Chriſtian Loyalty*, Chap. 5. pag. 544. I muſt aſſure him, though I charitably believe he has never read what the Doctor ſays there, yet I have done it very carefully, and can ſee nothing in it, but what is full againſt his Doctrine. The Doctor ſpeaks of the *Parisian* Maſſacre, as the Biſhop had done before him; and owns, if ſuch a Caſe as that could be ſuppoſed to happen here, it would have its great Difficulties. Which is directly againſt Mr. *H.* who would make no Difficulty in the Caſe, but upon a far leſs Temptation would readily determine, that the People were highly to blame, if they ſhould ſit ſtill, and not Arm in their own Defence: He would cry out of a *Paſſive Non-reſiſtance* in ſuch a dreadful Juncture, as the ſure way to ruin themſelves, and their Poſterity after them. But Dr. *Falkner* ſays no ſuch matter; he ſays, ſuch a Caſe would have its great Difficulties, if ſuppoſed; but is very unwilling to ſuppoſe any thing like it. Then he mentions *Grotius's* Judgment concerning it, who thinks, that in this utmoſt Extremity, the uſe of Self-defence, as a laſt Refuge, is not to be condemned; and ſays, If this be true, it muſt be upon this Ground, that ſuch Attempts of Ruining do ipſo facto include a diſclaiming the governing thoſe Perſons as Subjects, and conſequently of being their Prince or King. But he does by no means ſay, that it is either true; or does imply ſuch a Diſclaimer; but declares on the other hand, that there is greater Hurt to be feared from the making ſuch Suppoſitions, than from the Thing ſuppoſed; citing withal the forementioned Paſſage of Bp. *Bilſon*, and concluding with him, that If the Laws of the Land do not permit them to guard their Lives when thus aſſaulted, or IF THEY TAKE ARMS TO DEPOSE PRINCES, WE WILL NEVER EXCUSE THEM FROM REBELLION.

But

But though all these sadly fail Mr. H. giving their Judgment, not for, but against him, he has yet another Reserve, which he looks upon as of *most Moment*; that is, of the whole *Convocation*, the *Church of England's Representative*, in *Queen Elizabeth's Reign*, publickly acknowledging it *Glorious*, to *assist Subjects in the Resistance to their Sovereigns*, and their *Endeavours to rid themselves of their Tyranny and Oppressions*. Now who that reads this, but would immediately expect to find some Article or Canon to this purpose to be set before him for his Satisfaction, that they did make such a publick acknowledgment; or at least to have been directed to the Place in the Journals, or to some Writer of those Times, for the proof of it? But this is a vulgar way of procedure, and below an Author of Mr. H.'s Form. It is enough for him to say it, and if his Book fall into the hand of any that will not subscribe to his *αὐτὸς ἀπὸν*, they may turn over as many Volumes as they please; to see what they can find about it. But now after all, what if all this prove a meer Chimera and Imagination, and not only this pretended Acknowledgement, that *It is glorious to assist Subjects in their Resistance to their Sovereigns*, is no where to be found either in the Journals or Histories of those Times; but is inorcover contrary to (e) the Professions made by the Queen, and

P and

(e) Consonantly whereto Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, *Queen Elizabeth's Minister in Scotland*, argued in behalf of their *Queen*, That Obedience was to be yielded unto the Higher Powers, that carry the Sword; and the Queen was not subject to the judgment of any, but only of the Celestial Judge: That she could not be arraigned or brought to tryal before any Judge on the Earth: and That there is no Magistrate had any authority in *Scotland*, which is not derived from the authority of the Queen, and revocable at her pleasure. *Stranguage's Hist. of Mary Q. of Scotland*, An. 1567. p. 39: *Contra Throcmortonus ē sacrarum literarum autoritate de obsequio præstando supereminentioribus potestatibus gladium gestantibus multa proposuit, acriterq; differuit Reginam nullius judicio præterquam cœlestis Judicis subjacere, pro nullius Tribu-*

and the Doctrins taught and maintained by Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Bancroft, the two principal Men in that Convocation? If this be so, what will Mr. H. say for himself? Or what must the World think of his Writings, if he appear guilty of so gross an Imposition upon them, as this must be, if it cannot be made out? I challenge him therefore to produce any thing of the Convocation that speaks to this purpose, with a Promise, if he does it to any effect, that I will for the future have a greater regard for his confident Assertions, than I can yet bring myself to. But before he undertakes so hard a Task, I would beg of him to consult a Pamphlet printed in the Year 1690, and intituled, *A Defence of the Profession, which the Right Reverend Father in God John late Lord Bishop of Chichester made upon his Death-Bed*, from the 18th Page (falsly marked 26th) to the 38th, where he will find the Learned and Worthy Author has so entirely routed this vain Pretence, that I cannot imagin he will ever undertake the Proof of it: I am sure till he does give some better Evidence for such an Assertion, than I have yet been able to meet with, I must look upon it as a vain Boast, without any Foundation.

In short, after Mr. H.'s Brags, that *It doth not appear, that there hath been any Number of Men of Sense and Consideration, who have in reality condemned Resistance of the Higher Powers in all Possible Cases*, I cannot find he has yet instanced in one such who has not actually done it; whilst on the contrary, great Numbers of them have been produced that have done it, from time to time: Which is abundantly enough, as to the Judgment of our Divines. And now,

2. As

Tribunali in terris posse sisti, nullam esse magistratûs auctoritatem in Scotiâ quæ à Regina auctoritate non est delegata, & ab ipsâ revocabilis. *Cambden. Elizab. Ang. Regin. An. 1567. p. 115.* And the Author of *Le Martyre de la Royne d'Escoffe* owns that she promised their Queen, by this Sir N. Throgmorton, that she would give her all the Aid and Assistance in her power, if the Scotch Subjects would not return to their Allegiance. p. 138.

2. As to the Homilies, he tells us (f) he has *many things to offer in Reply*, and makes this the subject of several of the following Leaves. Hither therefore I should have followed him, and shewn how effectually he hath perform'd his Undertaking. But being happily prevented by an ingenious and worthy Person, who has had occasion to take this Task upon him, and has discharged it with very good success, in the ^(g)Treatise hereto annexed, I forbear to say any thing of it here; and referr the Reader to that Treatise; where he will easily discover to how little purpose Mr. H. had taken all the Pains he has been at, to bring the Homilies to the Sense of his Sermon; whilst every one else must needs see they plainly speak the Language of his Text, with S. Paul utterly condemning that Resistance, which Mr. H. is so desirous they should be thought to patronize.

C H A P. IV.

Whether Mr. H.'s Doctrine of Resistance be consistent with our own Municipal Laws?

HERE I must acquaint the Reader, that I do not pretend to give him a full account of what our Laws and Lawyers say against Resistance, but only to set before him such little Notices of this kind as have happened in my way. And I also beg Pardon of the Gentlemen of that Profession, that I should venture to meddle in a Faculty, in the Study whereof I have been so little conversant, and where I shall be sure to say so little, in comparison of what might justly be said upon so copious a subject. Yet I cannot doubt but that little Evidence I have to produce, under this head, is however a great deal more than Mr. H. will

P 2 ever

(f) P. 157.
 (g) A Letter to a Clergy-Man concerning Mr. Hoadly's Doctrine about y^e Homilies and Resistance. By m^r Stamp.

ever be able to give a solid and satisfactory Answer to. For in truth I do not think Sir *Dudley Digges*, or even the History of Passive Obedience, no nor *S. Paul's* thirteenth to the *Romans*, to be more manifestly and diametrically opposite to all Resistance of our Sovereign, than the *English* Constitution, and known Laws are. And it is very hard to conceive, and will require all Mr. *H.*'s Flourishes and Wit, to shew how what is condemned by the Laws of the Land, in conjunction with the Divine Laws, should yet not only become Lawful, but commence an important Duty, *honourable* and *glorious*, for no other reason, but because the contrary Practice may be attended with temporal Difficulties and Sufferings, and possibly with some present Inconveniences to the Communities where it obtains.

Now that Mr. *H.*'s dear Resistance stands condemned by the Divine Laws, and was acknowledged to be so both by the ancient Christian Church, when in its greatest Purity, and by our own Church ever since the Reformation, I have so fully proved, as to leave no manner of Plea for it, except upon Supposition, that our Prince were not really sovereign in his Dominions, but made accountable by the Constitution, and the Statutes now in force, to some either of the Nobles, or of the Commons, or of both together; in whom the Sovereignty were therefore to reside. This Supposition, I say, is all the Subterfuge that is left for opening a door to the Resistance pleaded for; and if this fail too, it will require a very good Assurance to appear for it, against all the Proof to the contrary, that the *Nature* of the thing is capable of, or that could be reasonably expected or desired, supposing the case to be as I have stated it.

If the Doctrine of Resistance had ever been intended, as THE MEASURE of the *English* Subjects SUBMISSION TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE, it is astonishing to think, that it should never have been enacted in Parliament, and the Bounds and Limits set to it, that no Directions should be given for the due Performance of it, nor any Rewards offered, or Honours designed,

or Advantages propounded for its Encouragement. The Maintenance of the Rights of the Community, and of our Posterity after us for many Generations, is not of so little Importance, as that it can be conceived our Legislators should never have thought it worth enjoining the only Method, if Mr. *H.* may be believed, of securing so great a Good. If some of them had happened to be careless and negligent, and have no regard for the Publick Welfare, nor once aim at recommending an *honourable* and *glorious* Prosecution of it; yet sure our Senators have not been all successively asleep for hundreds of Years together. Or if they had, who would believe the whole Body of the People to have been so too, and that none of these would try to awake them, and put them upon consulting how this our only means of Safety might be managed, to the benefit of all succeeding Generations? And till it can be shewn that they have taken this course, and have expressly prescribed Resistance of the Prince, in case of Mal-administration, as necessarily incumbent upon the Nation, or at least have declared us at liberty to resist, whensoever we shall think it proper, such Resistance can no way be said to be according to Law.

Supremacy naturally includes in it Irresistibility, inasmuch as none being Higher than the Highest, or Superiour to the Supreme, none therefore can have a right to call him to account for his Irregularities. It is an incontestable Truth that Inferiours have no power over their Superiours; and by consequence Subjects can have none over their Sovereign. And hence to make any Prince accountable to his People, must be only by some Compact between them, whereby the Supremacy is not properly placed in Him, but in some other Person or Persons, to whom he is, by virtue of this Compact, to be answerable for his Government. And were this the Nature of our Constitution, as it has been of some other Nations, it ought not to depend upon an imaginary, invisible *Original Contract*, but to be legible in some known authentick Record, that might testify the Time and Manner of making this Agreement, the Terms

of the Prince's Forfeiture, the particular Persons that were to take the Advantage of it, and the Judges that were to determine between them. And can Mr. H. say there is any thing like this to be found in our Law? His pretending only to be told *that the King is declared to be the Minister of God, only as he performs the positive Will of God, by doing all manner of good Service to his People,* shews him sensible that there is nothing of this to be produced from any good Authority, inasmuch as if he had the least knowledge of any, we should have been sure to hear of it with both Ears. His saying no more for himself than he does, is an abundant Proof, that he is quite run aground, and has nothing but his own Imagination to rely upon. He has nothing to plead from the Statute-Book, nor from the Common Law; that is, in short, he has nothing in our Constitution, whereon to found so groundless, as well as mischievous a Doctrine, as that of Resistance is.

What then can we judge of this Doctrine, if it not only be not taught in our Laws, but on the contrary be over and over condemned there, and under the severest Penalties, and without a Reserve for any particular case? If this does not make it highly illegal, it is impossible that any Law or Sanction whatever can make it so.

Now to satisfy the Reader that this is no vain Conceit of mine, no Hearsay-Story of I know not what *old Law*, that neither is now, nor ever was in being, but what we have the concurrent Testimony of Laws and Lawyers for, I shall proceed by these following Steps.

1. The King by our Law is the supreme Governor of these Nations. *Rex parem non habet*, says *Bracton* (a), *nec superiorem in Regno suo*: The King has neither superior nor equal in his Kingdom. And again, (b) *Omnes quidem sub Rege, & ipse sub nullo, nisi tantum sub Deo*: All else are under the King, but he is under none but God.
Parem

(a) De leg. & consuet. Angl. l. 2. c. 37. sect. 5. fol. 87.

(b) L. 1. c. 8.

Parem autem non habet in Regno suo, &c. *He has no equal in his Kingdom, because so he would lose his power of Commanding, since one equal has no Authority over another. Much less has he a superiour, nor ought any to be of greater Power than he, because so he would be below his Subjects, which would be a great Absurdity. And he ought to be under no Man, but under God and the Law, that is, the direction of it, because the Law makes him a King; that is, distinguishes him as such from a Tyrant, who resolves not to be directed by the Laws. As is plain from the following Words, Non est enim Rex, ubi dominatur Voluntas, & non Lex: For he is no King, who is governed merely by his own Will, and not by the Laws he is to act by. And especially by what is added in another place, (b) He is called King, not barely from his Governing, but from his Ruling well, for whilst he does this, he is a King, but when he imperiously oppresses his People, he is a Tyrant. (c) This is a full Acknowledgment of the King's Supremacy, in that it allows him neither superiour, nor equal, in all his Dominions. And what the result of this Supremacy is in this same Bracton's Opinion, follows at the end of that Chapter; namely, that supposing the King manages his Power ill, so as to give occasion for application to him for redress, then locus erit supplicationi, quod factum suum corrigit & emendet, quod*

P 4

quidem

(b) Dicitur enim rex à bene regendo, sed non regnando, quia rex est dum bene regit, tyrannus dum populum sibi creditum violentâ opprimit dominatione. l. 3. c. 9.

(c) In what Sence these Words of the same Author, l. 3. c. 9. Rex habet superiorem Deum, item legem per quam factus est Rex, item curiam suam, videlicet Barones, qui Comites dicuntur, quasi socii Regis, & qui habet socium habet magistrum, & ideo si Rex fuerit sine fræno, i. e. sine lege, debent ei frænum ponere; in what Sence, I say, these Words are to be understood, has been long since shewn by the very learned Author of the Harmony of Divinity and Law, printed in the Year 1684. p. 40, 41; and in the Royal Apology printed the same Year, from p. 25. to p. 27. In which Discourses they are sufficiently explained, and reconciled to the constant Doctrine of this famed Lawyer, and shewn to be no way inconsistent with what I have here cited from him in behalf of Non-resistance.

quidem si non fecerit, satis sufficit ei ad pœnam quod Dominum expectet ultorem: It is Punishment enough for him, not as Mr. H. would have said, that his Subjects are to rise up against him for the preservation of their own Rights, and those of their Posterity; but *that he is to expect, that GOD Almighty, his only superiour Lord, will take him to task for it.* Or though God should not do this presently, no Man, says the same Bracton (d), may presume to call his Actions in question, much less to oppose him with force and violence. This, as the loyal Judge Jenkyns observes (e), *shews where the supreme Power is.* And what Rights belong to this supreme Power, the said Bracton teaches in another place; (f) *Sciendum quod ipse Dominus Rex, &c.* You are to take notice that our Lord the King, who has ordinary Jurisdiction, and Dignity, and Power over all that are in his Kingdom, has also in his hand all the Rights pertaining to the Crown, to the Lay-Power, and the material Sword, as necessary for the Government of the Kingdom. He has likewise Justice, Judgment, and Jurisdiction, that by the help of these he may recompense each one according to his deserts, as becomes God's Minister, and Representative. It is in him to keep the Peace, and suppress Quarrels, Robberies, and Murders. He can coerce, and restrain, and punish Malefactors; can require his known approved Laws to be carefully observed, since otherwise his People are never the better for them. So also at another time he tells us, when the King being petitioned to redress the Subjects Grievances shall refuse it, though he wrongs his Subjects, he is yet to answer it to God only. *Cum Dominus Rex super hoc fuerit interpellatus, si in eadem persistit voluntate, quod velit tenentem esse defensum cum injuria, cum teneatur justitiam totis viribus defensare, ex tunc erit injuria ipsius Domini Regis, nec poterit ei necessitatem aliquis imponere, quod illam corrigat & emendet nisi velit, cum superiorem non habeat nisi Deum, & satis erit illi pro pœnâ quod Deum expectet ultorem*: (g) When our Lord the King being addressed

(d) Ibid. (e) Jenkyns. rediv. p. 3.

(f) L. 2. c. 24. sect. 1. fol. 55.

(g) L. 5. Tract. 3. c. 3. sect. 3. fol. 368.

dressed to for relief Still persists in the same mind, resolving to defend one to the wrong and damage of another, against the Obligation he is under to adhere to the Rules of Justice in all his Proceedings, the Injury then is his; yet still no Man may undertake to force him to reform what is amiss, unless he consent to it himself, because he has no superiour but God, and it is Punishment enough for him, that he must expect to be called to account for it by God. Here is sufficient Proof of the King's Supremacy, if it be capable of Proof from Mr. H.'s old Law, which thus expressly teaches what is here related. And if this be not good Evidence, I hope his old Law will be owned to be of no force, though it had been much more to ^{his purpose} the point than it is.

And the Lord Chief Justice Coke in *Cawdrey's Case*; (b) delivers it as an undoubted Truth, That by the ancient Laws of this Realm, this Kingdom of England is an absolute Empire and Monarchy, consisting of one Head, (i) which is the King, and a Body politic, compact, and compounded of many, and almost infinite several, yet well agreeing Members, ——— next and immediately under God, subject and obedient to the Head, &c. This I hope Mr. H. will allow to be a full and clear Acknowledgment of the King's supreme Authority, and Jurisdiction; and that, according to this great Oracle of the Law, all his People, the whole Community as well as particular Persons, owe him Allegiance and Subjection. It is noted also by the same great Lawyer, that in the nineteenth Year of Edw. III. the Archbishop of York was sued in the King's name, for non-admission of a Clerk to a Benefice in that Diocese; (k) where he is charged with high Contempt against the King, his Crown, and Dignity, (l) in refusing to execute his Sovereign's Command. And we are told moreover, that in the

(b) *Rep. To. 5. De jure Regis Ecclesiast.*

(i) *In direct Contradiction to Mr. H.'s Determination, That the King, Lords and Commons are more properly the Head of that Publick, in which we are concerned. Pref. to his second Edition. p. 7. (k) Ibid.*

(l) *Supremi Domini Mandata. So likewise the King's Crown is styled Corona Supremi Domini Regis. ibid. Et alibi passim.*

the time of the said *Edw. III.* (m) it is often resolved, that the last Lapse of an Ecclesiastical Benefice is to the King, *tanquam SUPREMO intra Regnum suum*, as the SUPREME within his own Kingdom. Which Assertion, though particularly levelled against the vain Pretences of the Pope, to a Jurisdiction over these Nations, is nevertheless expressed in such general Terms, as to imply an indisputable Supremacy over all his Subjects. And in the conclusion of that Case, the Effect of all that went before is declared to be, That as well by the antient Common Laws of this Realm of England, in all succession of Ages, and by authority of many Acts of Parliament, antient and of later times, the Kingdom of England is an absolute Monarchy, and the King is (n) the only supreme Governour, as well over Ecclesiastical Persons, and in Ecclesiastical Causes, as Temporal, within this Realm.

And that the King has a supreme Authority over all, is farther evident from the Oath of Homage taken antiently by Tenants to their Lords; which had always this Reservation in it, (o) *Saving the Faith that I owe unto our SOVEREIGN Lord the King.*

But not to insist farther upon the Opinion or Authority of Lawyers, how great soever, nor any Inferences of theirs, how well soever founded, if we consult the Statutes themselves we shall find them likewise to be of the same strain, and that they own no other Supreme Head of the Community, but only the King, or Queen, to whom all Authority under God is attributed by them, and all the People are put in Subjection, and required to pay true Fidelity and Allegiance. I begin with the Statute of *Premunire*, (p) whereby it is declared, That the Crown of England hath been so free at all times, That it hath been in no Earthly

(m) Ibid.

(n) Quodq; Rex solus & summus sit gubernator, &c.

(o) Coke's Instit. Part. I. sect. 85. (p) 16. Rich. II. c. 5.

Earthly Subjection, but immediately subject to God in all things, touching the Regality of the same Crown, and to none other; and so, as to no foreign Jurisdiction, so neither to any Power of the People, either the whole, or any part of them. And the Statute for Restraint of Appeals (q) begins thus, Whereas by divers sundry and authentick Histories and Chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this Realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the World, governed by one Supreme Head and King — unto whom all sorts and degrees of People, divided in terms, and by names of Spirituality and Temporality, been bounden, and owen to bear next to God, a natural and humble Obedience: He being also institute and furnished, by the goodnes and sufferance of God, with plenary, whole, entire Power, Preeminence, Authority, Prerogative, and Jurisdiction. — Does this look as if the King were accountable to his People? or can it be shewn that such singular Privileges were ever ascribed to one that was so, by the Laws of his Land, and the Joint Suffrage of his People? According to this Statute the Realm of England is an Empire, the King is the supreme Head of it, and has the entire Power and Authority residing in him, and to him all the People, of whatever sort or degree, are bound to pay their natural Allegiance and Submission. And if this does not prove the Supremacy to be solely in the Prince, next under God, and that next to God he is to be obeyed by all his Subjects, and is accountable to God only, I must come to Mr. H. to learn what Words would convince him of it, supposing it ever so true.

Again, another Statute of the same King, concerning *Peter-Pence and Dispensations*, (a) speaks thus, *This your Grace's Realm recognizing no Superiour under God, but only your Grace, —* Which Words I cannot construe to mean less, than that the King was here owned to be Superiour to all Persons whatsoever within this Realm. And indeed no less is implied in that Title so usually given

(q) 24. Hen. VIII. c. 12. (a) 25. Hen. VIII. c. 21.

given the Prince, both in the Statutes, and upon all other occasions, of our *SOVEREIGN Lord the King*. For how can he be owned by all to be their *Sovereign*, if the Supremacy be not in him, and he has not a Power paramount to, and uncontrollable by any other Person, or Persons within his Dominions; or even by the whole Community? This is so plain and undeniable, that I need say no more about it.

But nothing can be more express to this purpose, than the Oath of Supremacy enacted by Queen *Elizabeth*, in the beginning of her long Reign, and from that time always taken, and at length made a part of the Test (a) in K. *Charles II*'s. time, and so continued till the late Revolution. So that a very great Part of the Nation, and especially of the Nobility and Gentry, together with all the Clergy, for divers successive Reigns have actually and solemnly attested the truth hereof, many of whom are yet living, that have taken it in these Words; (b) *I do utterly testify and declare in my Conscience, that the Queen's* or King, &c. King *Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other Her Highness's Dominions and Countries.* Here the Queen was not only acknowledged to be the Governor, and to whom therefore the Subjects Obedience was due, but the *Supreme Governor*, and consequently unaccountable to, and irresistible by her Subjects; and the only *Supreme Governor*, and so that she had no *Co-ordinate Power* to partake of that Supremacy, and was not only *Major singulis*, but *universis* too. And in the first Statute of the 5th of the Queen it was farther enacted, that *Every Person which shall hereafter be elected or appointed a Knight, Citizen, or Burgeß, or Baron of any of the Five Ports, for any Parliament or Parliaments hereafter to be holden, shall from henceforth, before he shall enter into the Parliament-House, or have any Voice there, openly receive and pronounce the said Oath, before the Lord-Steward for the time being, or his Deputy, or Deputies for that time to be appointed. And he which shall enter into the Parliament-House, without taking the said Oath, shall be deemed no Knight, Citizen, or Burgeß for that Parliament,*

--- but

(a) 25. Car. II. c. 2.

(b) 1. Eliz. c. 1. 19.

--- but shall be to all intents and purposes, as if he had never been returned or elected. And though this Oath hath been thought fit to be omitted since the Revolution, the Supremacy asserted by these Statutes has never been contradicted by any later Acts, nor any thing ever pretended to prove this an unlawful Oath, and the Sovereignty asserted by it disagreeable to the Nature of our English Constitution. And I am very sure all we who have been required by Law to Swear it over and over, must be inexcusable to the last degree, if to please any Party, or serve any present Turn, we should in defiance to the Doctrine of the Laws, and our own Oaths deliberately taken thereupon, deny what we have thus reasonably, truly and legally avowed upon our Consciences and Oaths. Mr. H. probably may never have taken that Oath, but since he knows Multitudes of others have, and as directed and required by Law, he must needs know that this Supremacy is a necessary, essential Part of our Constitution; and to deny it, is to contradict the positive Doctrine of the Statutes that have enjoined it. Which being once granted, the Inference made by the Author of the *Royal Apology* must take place, (b) *That if the King is Supreme, then he hath no Superiour; if only Supreme, then no equal: If over all Persons, --- then all Persons in these his Realms, and all other his Dominions and Countries, are subordinate or subject to him; and if subordinate, then none of them either severally or jointly are coordinate with him; I add, or any way intituled to act as his Superiours, and call him to account, or forcibly to proceed against him for his Mal-administration.*

And that the King is owned to be thus Supreme by the Common Law, is abundantly shewn by Mr. *Sheringham*, in his Learned Discourse entituled, *The King's Supremacy asserted*; and especially in the fourth and fifth Chapters.

I conclude this Argument therefore in the Words of the judicious Bishop *Sanderfon*, (i) *To us of this Nation,*
it

(b) P. 8.

(i) *Pref. to A. Bp. Usher's Power of the Prince.* n. 16.

it is so evident where it [the Supremacy] resideth, that we needed not have recourse to Statesmen and Lawyers, for Information in that Point. The known Laws of the Land have declared it so fully, and particularly the Oath of Supremacy expressed it so clearly, that any Man of ordinary capacity may understand it, as well as the deepest Statesman in the World.

2. All Allegiance is constantly owned to be due to the King, and to him only: To him we have been all along required to promise and swear it, and never to the People, either Collectively or Representatively. Ligeance, says the Lord Chief Justice Coke, (k) is a true and faithful Obedience of the Subject due to his Sovereign, and is an incident inseparable to every Subject; for as soon as he is born, he oweth by Birthright Ligeance and Obedience to his Sovereign. Consonantly whereto says Comel, (l) Liege (Ligius) is a Word borrowed from the Fendists, and has two several Significations in our Common Law; sometimes being used for Liege Lord, and sometimes for Liege Man. Liege Lord is he that acknowledgeth no Superior, Liege Man is he that oweth Ligeancie to his Lord. And the Statute-Book speaks nothing more plainly, than that Allegiance is due, and of right belongs to our Sovereign Lord the King. In the 11th Year of Richard II. (m) All the Lords, Bishops and Commons were openly Sworn in Parliament, --- saving their Allegiance to the King, and their due Obedience to his Prerogative and Laws. And Mr. Sheringham tells us, (n) that in the Acts of Parliament, The King is called the Liege Lord of his Subjects, and the Subjects are called the King's Liege People. In 26th Hen. VIII. Ch. 2. this Oath was required to be taken by all and singular the King's Subjects, as well the Nobles Spiritual and Temporal, as others: Ye shall sweare to bear Faith, Truth, and Obedience, all onely to the King's Majesty, to his Heirs, ---- and not to any others. ——— And long

(k) Calvin's Case. Rep. To. 7. p. 4.

(l) Interpreter; in the Word Liege.

(m) Cotton's Abridgment of the Tower-Records. p. 322.

(n) The King's Supremacy asserted. ch 3. p. 17.

long before this, in the *Saxon-Times*, King *Arthur*, and ~~and~~ after him *Edward the Confessor*, (n) require it to be taken at the *Folkmote* every Year in the beginning of *May*. Such was the Oath that was wont to be taken at the Court-Leet. And this *Ligeancie*, or Allegiance, was Sworn to the King, says *Coke*, (o) to the *Natural Person of the King*, and was not due to the *Politick Capacity* only. And again, (p) that it was *proprium quarto modo*, to the King; *omni, soli, & semper*. And oftentimes in the Reports of our Book-Cases, and in Acts of Parliament also, the Crown or Kingdom is taken for the King himself. But nothing can possibly be more home to my Purpose, than the Declaration of all the Three Estates in the first of *James I.* binding themselves and their Posterity to him and his Heirs for ever; and the Oath of Supremacy by Queen *Elizabeth*, recited under the former Head; and that Oath of this same King *James*, wherein we swear, to bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, and him and them to defend to the utmost of our Power, against all Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever. Both which Oaths were also made a part of the Test: 25. Car. II. c. 2. Whence it can be no longer doubted, to whom an *English Subject's* Allegiance is entirely and solely due, and consequently whom he is never to resist, till Allegiance and Resistance can be proved to be the same thing, or at least to be clearly agreeable and consistent with each other.

3. Another irrefragable Argument for proving the Illegality of all Resistance by the *English* Constitution, is, that the Power of the *Militia* is by Law declared to be solely in the King. For every Sovereign as such, is naturally, and our own Sovereign in particular, is declared to be the Fountain of all Military, as well as Civil Power. And as no Man may take upon him, to act as a Judge, or Justice of the Peace, or but as a Petty Constable, without an Authority derived from his Prince;

(n) Leg. Edovardi Regis. 35. apud Lamb. de prisca Anglorum legibus. p. 146.

(o) Calvin's Case. p. 10.

(p) P. 12.

Prince ; so neither may any take the Sword, or thrust himself into a Military Office, without a Commission from him, or at least the Appointment of somebody thus Commissioned. And whosoever shall venture to do so, must expect the Consequence of such an Attempt to fall heavy upon him, so long as the Laws may be permitted to have their Course, and not be silenced by the Power of the Sword. God has placed the Sword, no less than the Scepter, in the Sovereign's hand, and given him Authority to use it, and to none else within his Dominions, but who take it up for his Service, and by Order from him. So says *Fleta*, (q) *The King hath in his hand all the Rights of the Crown and Temporal Jurisdiction, and the Power of the Sword, as necessary for the Government of the Kingdom.* And so says the Statute-Book, nothing being more evidently against Raising any sort of War against the King, than the (r) Statute of Treason. (s) *The fourth Branch of which is, That it is Treason, if a Man do levy War against the King in his Realm, or be adherent to the King's Enemy in his Realm, giving them Aid and Comfort in the Realm, or elsewhere.* This, if against a bad, a ruining destructive King, or even a King that does not continually attend to the end and design of his Office, is the very *Resistance* so earnestly pleaded for. And yet even such Resistance of the King, whosoever, or whatsoever he be, is here condemned under no less a Penalty than Forfeiture of Estate, Honour, and Life. And Sir *Edward Coke* upon

(q) *Habet Rex in manu sua omnia jura quæ ad coronam & Laicalem pertinent potestatem, & materiale gladium qui pertinet ad regni gubernaculum. l. i. c. 17.*

(r) 25. Edw. III. Stat. 5. c. 2.

(s) *It is to be noted that this was only a restraining Act, and did not make any thing Treason that was not so before at the Common Law, but on the contrary reduced this heavy Charge into a less compass, making thenceforward many things not to be Treason, which the Common Law had arraigned as such. So that whatever is here branded for Treason, is Treason both by Statute and Common Law ; and in particular to Levy War against the King is so.*

upon this Statute says, the same was Treason by the Common Law before; and that if any levy War to expulse Strangers, to deliver Men out of Prisons, to remove Counsellors, against any Statute, or to any other End, without Warrant, this is levying War against the King; because they take upon them Royal Authority. So that if we attend only to this one Statute and the Common Law, no Man can have a Commission to raise and list Soldiers, to train and muster them; or to be a Commander, or General; or Captain over them, but from the King. And no Man can ~~can~~ take any such Employment upon him without the King's Commission, whatever Benefit he design to the Society by it, but he endangers the loss of his Head. It is a well-known Story of Sir *Richard Walsh*, High Sheriff of *Worcestershire* in King *James* the First's Days; that having pursued the Gunpowder-Traitors out of his County, though *duisfully* done, as the King himself bears him (t) witness; nevertheless he found it necessary to confess his Offence to the King, and obtain a Pardon for having carried his Forces beyond their proper Bounds, to do a very signal Service to his Majesty, only in an illegal way. So it has in like manner been observed of the Earl of (u) *Shrewsbury* in King *Henry* the Eighth's time, that having in a suddain Rebellion which then arose, raised Arms for suppressing it without the King's Commission, he thought himself obliged to procure his Majesty's Pardon, though he had happily succeeded in his Design, to the apparent Service of his King and Country.

But to put the Matter yet more out of doubt, in K. *Charles* the Second's time; when the Parliament first, and afterwards *CROMWELL* and his Party, had taken upon them to wage a rebellious War; the former against his Royal Father, whom they had barbarously murdered; in an inhuman manner, beyond the Example of former Ages; and the others against himself, keeping him from the Possession of his Throne, for many Years together;

Q

(t) *King James's Works.* p. 244.

(u) *Holinshead's Chronicles;* in the Year 1536.

gether; to prevent any such undutiful Designs for the future, it was formally and solemnly declared in full Parliament, (u) *That within all his Majesty's Realms and Dominions, the sole Supreme Government, Command and Disposition of the Militia, and of all Forces by Sea, and of all Forts and Places of Strength, is by the Laws of England and ever was the undoubted Right of his Majesty, and his Royal Predecessors, Kings and Queens of England; and that both, or either of the Houses of Parliament cannot, nor ought to pretend to the same; nor can, nor lawfully may raise or levy any War, Offensive or Defensive, against his Majesty, his Heirs or lawful Successors. And by this Act it is also ordered, that No Person whatsoever, whether Peer of the Realm, or of Inferiour Rank, shall be capable of acting as a Lieutenant, or a Deputy-Lieutenant, or other Officer or Soldier, till he shall have taken the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, according to the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom. In which Oaths, they were to Swear, amongst other things, that they would bear Faith and true Allegiance to the King's Highness, his Heirs and LAWFUL Successors; that they did acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare, in their Conscience, that their Sovereign Lord King Charles was LAWFUL AND RIGHTFUL KING OF THIS REALM, and of all other his Majesty's Dominions and Countries; that they would bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, and him and them would defend to the utmost of their Power, against all Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever. The same Oaths were likewise required to be taken (x) by all Mayors, Aldermen, and others concerned in the Government of Corporations and Burroughs, together with this following; I declare and believe that it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever to take up Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or against those that are commissioned by him; so help me God. And by the Act of Uniformity, (y) All Ecclesiastical Persons, with divers others*

(u) *The Militia Act.* 13 Char. II. c. 6.

(x) 13. Car. II. c. 1. (y) 13 & 14. Car. II. c. 14.

others there particularly specified, were to subscribe to the Truth of that Assertion of the Unlawfulness of Resistance upon *whatsoever* Pretence. And all Rectors, Vicars, and Curates, were to make the same Declaration in the publick Congregation. This Declaration was enjoined also to be made (z) by all Members of Select Vestries. This was plainly and indisputably the case before the Revolution. And though these Oaths and Declarations have for some Reasons been thought fit since to be laid aside; yet the Lawfulness of Resistance has never been enacted. Nor does it by any means follow from hence, that all Resistance is not still as much condemned by our Laws as ever, though the Subjects are not expected to bear their Testimony against it as formerly. Nor would the Obligation of the Law cease in this respect, though no Oaths or Declarations at all were imposed upon either Clergy or Laity.

I know not what can be objected to these Statutes and Oaths, they are so full and clear against all Resistance, leaving no room for it upon whatever Occasion. Not only good Kings are here required to be submitted to, and taught to have the Power of the Sword in their hand, but the King indefinitely, whosoever he be, or howsoever qualified. The *Militia* is declared to be, and have been by Law, at the Disposal and Command of the King and his Royal Predecessors, and that this was so undoubtedly their Right, that neither of the Houses of Parliament, nor both of them together, may pretend to it. Nor can they lawfully raise or levy any War against the Crown. And though this of itself were abundantly enough, to silence all Pretences of the Lawfulness of Resistance, upon whatever Account, yet still to do it the more effectually, these Words are added; *Offensive or Defensive*, which including all sorts of War against the Prince, make it evident, that all such Wars are utterly unlawful. And the rather if it be considered that even a *Defensive* War is here condemned; which supposes an Invasion made upon the People, or

Q 2

their

their Rights, or at least an imagination of such a Design; without which there would be no temptation to Rise for their own Defence. Wherefore a War made only for the Subjects own Defence, and by the pretended Authority of either or both Houses of Parliament, or of the Body of the People either collectively or representatively, being thus positively declared to be against Law, I am exceedingly at a loss to find, what forcible Resistance can possibly be according to Law. Besides that there is another Act (a) *for ordering the Forces in the several Counties of England*, that begins in the same manner and almost in the very same Words with the *Militia-Act*, and so must inevitably teach the same Doctrine. As it does first, and then proceeds to enact, and declare, That *the King's Most Excellent Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, shall and may from time to time, as occasion shall require, issue forth Commissions, &c.* So that in both these Statutes, it is observable that the King may give out what Commissions he pleases, for raising, training, and arming of Soldiers; and that this is, and always was, the peculiar Prerogative of the Prince, so as that none of his Subjects, not even the two Houses of Parliament, may presume to raise any Army against him, though for even a Defensive War. Which in my opinion is no Proof of the Legality of Resistance. And for this short Reason, because it is forbidden under the most favourable Circumstances, when only by way of Defence against the Assaults of an unjust and tyrannical Sovereign. *Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society over which they are placed, yet these Laws are so far from declaring it Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors, that they utterly forbid all manner of forcible Opposition to them, as no way consistent with their Duty, and leave the Ordering of all the Forces both by Sea and Land, purely to the*
King's

(a) 13 & 14. Car. II. c. 3.

King's Direction, not to the Will of any of his Subjects. This is full Proof, and such as cannot be got over.

Whereto I would also subjoin an Argument *ad hominem* in relation to the forementioned Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*. Which though not at present in use, yet it may be remembred, that not only the whole Clergy for a long time together, but the present Lords Archbishops, and very near all the Bishops, and a great part of the inferiour Clergy, now in being, have over and over taken these Oaths. And I hope Mr *H.* will not have so little deference for their Judgment, as to charge them all with having sworn, as well as declared, and subscribed, what they did not understand, or that what they thus swore, declared, and subscribed, was not true. And if it was true then, it must be so still, unless it can be shewn, that the Constitution is quite changed since in this respect, and the Resistance then condemned as unlawful, is now taught and established by some new Law; or at least that the Statutes then condemning it, have been all solemnly and effectually repealed; which is not yet so much as pretended. Nor must only King *Charles II*d's Statutes have been repealed to make way for Resistance, before it can be reconciled to Law, but (a) divers others of much
Q 3 ancienter

(a) *Besides the forementioned Statute of Treasons, 25. Edw. III. c. 2. in the 7th Year of Edw. I. Stat. 30. die Octobris, it was owned by the Prelates, Earls, Barons, and the Commonalty of the Realm, that to the King it belonged, and to his royal Seigniorie, straightly to defend Force of Armour, and all other Force, &c. The famous Statute 11. Hen. VII. c. 1. begins thus, The King our sovereign Lord calling to his remembrance, the Duty of Allegiance of his Subjects of this Realm, and that they by reason of the same are bound to serve their Prince and Sovereign Lord for the time being, in his Wars, for the Defence of him and the Land, &c. 2 & 3 Edw. VI. c. 2. Soldiers are said to owe their bounden Duties to the King's Highness. And again, 4 & 5. Phil. & Mar. c. 3. proceeds upon it as a known Truth, That heretofore Commandment hath been given by the King's and Queen's*

ancienter date. For this was no new Authority then given the King, but what belonged to the Crown long before, and was expressly acknowledged to do so.

4. The next Proof of the Illegality of Resistance is, what I have already mentioned, that it is declared no less an Offence than High Treason. And I presume I may take it for granted, that the Law does not approve of, or recommend, much less enjoin any sort of Treason. In the third part of the Lord Chief Justice *Coke's Institutes*, fol. 6. 2. it is related, that in the 43d Year of *Q. Elizabeth*, the Earl of *Essex*, and others, assembled a Body of Men, not to offer Violence to the Queen's Person, but only to remove some of her Council, and this was adjudged Treason. And to depose the King, or take him by force, to imprison him till he hath yielded to certain Demands, is Treason, says (a) Judge *Jenkyns*, and was adjudged accordingly in the Lord *Cobham's Case*. And in the Act passed in the 5th of *Edw. II.* entituled *Exilium Hugonis de Spencer Patris, & Filii*, the first Article is, That they had affirmed and published in writing, that Homage and Oath of Allegiance were due, more by reason of the Crown, than by reason of the Person of the King, and that if the King did not demean himself according to Reason, in the Exercise of his Government, his Subjects might remove him by force. Exactly Mr. *H.'s Resistance in some cases!* Yet this the Lord Chief Justice *Coke* calls (b) a damnable and damned Opinion, and tells us moreover that it was condemned by another Act of Parliament, 1. *Edw. III. cap. 1.* Which one would think were Proof enough, what our Laws demand and expect from the Subjects in this case, and that they admit of no Resistance by force, in whatever Case, or upon whatever Account.

5. A

Queen's Majesties, and others the Progenitors of the Queen's Majesty, Kings of this Realm, to divers and sundry Persons, to muster their Majesties People, and Subjects of their Realm of *England*, and to levy a number of them for the Service of their Majesties and of this Realm, in their Wars, &c.

(a) *Jenkins. rediv. p. 20.*

(b) *Calvin's Case. p. 11.*

5. A farther Argument against the Legality of Resistance is, that our Law declares against all Coercion of the Sovereign, as a practice no way consistent with the nature of the *English* Constitution. *Satis sufficit ei ad pœnam*, says Bracton, (a) as I have before observed ; *It is Punishment enough for him, that God will be a Revenger of his Miscarriages*. And there is no necessity therefore that any else, especially any of his own Subjects, who are to obey, not to punish him, should have the Power of doing it. And the learned Author of the *Harmony of Divinity and Law* observes, (b) That the very Notion of Sovereignty and Subjection implies, that the People have no Power or Authority, but what they have from their Prince ; and therefore they can of themselves have no coercive Power or Authority over him, who is for that very reason their Sovereign, because he hath coercive Power and Jurisdiction over them. Wherefore unless we can imagine this Contradiction, that we may be Subjects and Sovereigns at the same time, and both superiour and inferiour to the same Prince, or that the same Sovereign Prince may be subject, to those over whom he is Supreme, it must needs be acknowledged, that Subjects have no Authority to resist their Sovereign, and that by consequence to do so, would be an unlawful or unauthoritative Act. Nor is this the Doctrine only of Reason, and of our Lawyers, but of the Statutes too, which are so plain and full as to put the matter out of question with all unprejudiced Persons. Particularly (c) the Act of Attainder of several Persons guilty of the horrid Murder of King CHARLES I. the more certainly to prevent all manner of doubt, concerning the King's Irresistibility, for all time coming, do in the most solemn and formal manner declare, That by the undoubted and fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, neither the Peers of this Realm, nor the Commons, nor both together, in Parliament, or out of Parliament, nor the People collectively, or representatively, nor any other Persons whatsoever, ever had, have, hath, or ought to have, any coercive Power over the Persons of the Kings of this Realm.

Q 4

It

(a) L. 1. c. 8.

(b) P. 6.

(c) 12. Car. II. c. 30.

It is not possible to forbid all Coercion in more express Words than these are; for if any part of the Nation had a Power of coercing the King, the two Houses of Parliament must undoubtedly have the fairest Pretence to it; but here we are taught that *neither the Peers of the Realm, nor the Commons, nor the People* howsoever considered, have any such Power over their Sovereign, nor ever had by the Constitution of this Kingdom. And this is noted by a learned Person, (a) and well acquainted with the Laws, to be no alteration of the Constitution, but only declarative of what was originally so. Who tells us moreover very rightly, that the true foundation of that Axiom, *the King can do no Wrong*, is this, that *there is no Right or Remedy against his Royal Person*. Now this Statute is such an express Attestation against all Violence to be offered at any time to the King, as not only needs nothing farther to explain it, but that it cannot possibly be explained in fuller and more significant Words, than those of the Statute itself. For here is shewn what always was, as well as what shall be for the future, what has been always looked upon as *the undoubted and fundamental Constitution* of our Government, and what is for all succeeding Generations to be looked upon as such; namely, that whilst the Laws are suffered to have their course, and People will be guided by them, the Kings of this Nation, as they have hitherto been, so must they still remain exempt from all Coercion, either from their own Subjects, or any others whatsoever. And if this can be reconciled to the Doctrine of Resisting them, we need not despair of *S. Paul's* being proved to plead for it too, *Rom. 13. 1, 2.* where it is as evident as Words can make it, that he condemns it under the most dreadful Penalty that can be; or to make any other part either of the Divine, or Humane Laws, stoop to whatsoever Sense we please, though in the most direct Contradiction that can be, to the natural and genuine Meaning of the Words.

6. And

(a) Dr. Kennet Dean of Peterburgh in his Sermon before the House of Commons, Jan. 30. 1705-6.

6. And *lastly*, there is no taking Arms against the King without endangering his Life, if he should come to a Battle ; which is certainly in construction of Law, conspiring or imagining the Death of the King. And this not only the Lord Chief Justice (a) *Hale* , but all Lawyers without dispute, own to be Treason by our Law ; and all Judges hold themselves bound to proceed against such who are concerned in it as Traytors. And the Law is the same in this point, whether the King be good or bad, and must be allowed to stand so, till the contrary can be made out by as good Law, as any that are brought to the contrary ; and particularly as (b) the Statute of Treasons, which puts it in the Front of the several Branches of this heinous and dangerous Crime, and allots to it the heaviest Penalties our Law inflicts in any case.

The Sum is, that as God's Law forbids all Resistance of the Higher Powers, though such as a *Claudius*, or a *Nero*, so our own National Laws declare the King, without distinction of Good or Bad, to be the only Supreme Governor of these Lands; that he has an undoubted Right to our Allegiance; and the *Militia* and the Power of the Sword belongs to him alone; and it is no less than Treason to usurp it without his Commission; as also that there is no Right of Coercion over the Kings of this Realm ; and even imagining the King's Death, which every one is construed to do, that takes up Arms against him, makes the Person so imagining a Traytor, and liable to all the Penalties of Treason. And if this be not enough to prove the Illegality of all Resistance by force of Arms, according to the Tenour of our Laws, and the Nature of our Constitution, nothing in the World ever was, or can be proved. Here is such a legal Establishment of Passive Obedience, as makes it the indispensable Duty of every *English* Subject, who would act agreeably to the Laws, not only of God, but of the Land. And how a Man
can

(a) *Pleas of the Crown, in the Chapter of High-Treason.*

(b) 25. Edw. III. Stat. 5. c. 2.

can with a good Conscience break through so invincible a Restraint, Mr. *H.* may please to shew when he shall be able. But then he must do it by much better, and more solid and substantial Answers, than those we have yet seen.

He pretends indeed to have vindicated his Doctrine in point of Law; but so weakly and in so lame a manner, that I cannot conceive how he could either satisfy himself, or expect others to be satisfied with such slight Pretences.

1. *I desire, says he, (a) it may be considered, that I was to act the part of a Divine, and not of a Lawyer, — and if there should be any thing in Human Laws contrary to what I have taught, this will not prove the falshood of it.* This I confess is stoutly affirmed; but it is not Affirmations we want, but good solid Proof of the Truth of them. For if this Doctrine of Resistance could be supposed not to contradict natural and revealed Religion, it would by no means follow from hence, that it might not be restrained by Human Laws. For these have an undoubted Power of binding our Liberty in divers respects, and making that necessary, which of itself is not so. It is neither contrary to Natural, nor Revealed Religion, for a Man who is not free of the City of London to set up his Trade there, nor for a Minister of the Gospel to Baptize without the Sign of the Cross, nor for a Magistrate to enter upon his Office without a previous Oath for the faithful Discharge of it. But when the Laws of Church or State have ordered these, or other like Qualifications or Actions, as necessary for all that would engage in such an undertaking, it will never vacate those Laws, or take off their Obligation, to say the contrary Practice does not contradict either Natural or Revealed Religion. But if all Resistance of the *Higher Powers* is forbidden by Religion upon pain of *Damnation*, as every one that does not wilfully shut his Eyes must see it is; and if our Laws apparently place the Sovereignty in the Prince, and make him irresistible,

as

(a) *Measures of Submission*, p. 112.

as the foregoing Considerations fully prove, this will irrefragably evince *the Falshood of what Mr. H. has taught*, and will shew all Resistance here amongst us to be utterly unlawful, and that he is as much out in his Divinity, whilst he preaches it up and defends it, as he is in his Law; that is to say, he has grossly failed in both.

2. He next tells us, *It is absurd to expect there should be express Provision made in the Law, for all great and extraordinary Occasions.* But it is certainly much more absurd, to interpret the Law to a quite different Sense, from what the Words naturally and necessarily import, and to maintain that, when it over and over forbids all Resistance, without any manner of Exception, and under the severest Penalties, it must yet be understood to mean only in Cases of less Importance; and that if the Danger increase, and the Temptation grows strong, the Law must not be supposed to interfere with the Directions of Flesh and Blood, but Men may break through all the strictest Obligations it lays upon them, and so may be both Traytors, and good Subjects at the same time, and both for acting against Law. Traytors they must be, because the Laws make all Resistance Treason; and good Subjects, because Mr. H. will not allow Provision to be made in the Law for great and extraordinary Occasions. And this notwithstanding the Laws have, as positively as may be, forbidden all Resistance, all Coercion, all Attempts against the Prince in any case, and even a Defensive War.

3. But, says Mr. H. *it is much more absurd to imagine, that the Law can consent to its own Ruin and Destruction.* And this I take to be a very good Argument, against its allowance of Resistance in any case, there being no readier way for overturning the Law than that is. *Inter arma silent Leges*, is a Maxim grounded on long Experience. And it is easy to conceive that they, who have first broken their way through the Laws to take up Arms, will not be more observant of them, when they have those Arms in their Hands. Possibly Mr. H. may be of opinion, that Rapine, and Plunder, and Murder, and Rebellion, and all the other Wickednesses that

that usually attend *the Resistance he has taught*, are more for the Preservation of the Laws, than a quiet, submissive, and conscientious Observance of them. But he has no Authority to impose the like Belief upon others, who desire to judge impartially, and be guided by their own best Reasonings, and not by the Dictates of his Fancy.

4. *It is I think*, says Mr. H. *agreed on by all Casuists, that no Human Law can oblige the Conscience, which manifestly contradicts the Publick Good.* This Plea of *Publick Good* I have particularly considered in the former part of this Discourse, and shall not trouble the Reader with a needless Repetition. But yet some farther Considerations it may not be amiss to add in this place, because I find it so much insisted upon.

I Wherefore in the first place I would ask, Whether the Laws or Mr. H.'s Opinion be the best Standard of the *Publick Good*? These were made upon a consideration of the Mischiefs his Method of securing the Publick had brought upon it; and were designed to prevent the like destructive Courses for the future. And I should think myself highly to blame, if I should take upon me to say, they are not to be understood in that Sense, to which the Words most naturally direct, and which most exactly answers the End of the Legislators in enacting them, but must be interpreted to a quite contrary purpose, because what some Men falsely call the *Publick Good* is necessarily to over-rule them. Which is a Pretence, that is not only made to serve as a Plea for all the Treasons and Rebellions that ever are acted, nothing being more usual, than for the Ringleaders of such Wickedness to cry out with *Abalom*, though perhaps with no more truth than he did, (a) *See thy matters are good and right, but there is no man deputed of the King to hear thee: Oh that I were made Judge in the Land, that every man which hath any suit, or cause, might come unto me, and I would do him justice!* This Pretence I say, is not only made to serve as a Plea for all Treasons and

(a) 2 Sam. 15. 3. 4.

and Rebellions, but which is more to my present purpose, is a clear acknowledgment that the Laws of the Land are against Resistance, because otherwise they would not need to be over-ruled in order to the *Publick Good*.

2. Whilst the Laws are owned for the Standard of our Obedience and Submission, we have a known Rule to walk by ; but when these are over-ruled by a Pretence of *Publick Good*, we are immediately in a Wilderness, and know not which way to direct our course. Here the Paths are as various as Mens Fancies and Designs ; and what one assuredly knows to be destructive of the Publick Welfare, another cries up with all the vehemence that may be, as the only way to make the Nation happy, and will treat you very roughly if you will not submit all to his Decision, and theirs who are of his Party, and embarked in the same Designs with him. Which does not appear to me such a blessed Change, as should make all Men exceedingly in love with it.

3. For any thing I can see, this Pretence of *Publick Good* would plead to all Intents and Purposes as strongly against an *Hereditary Government*, as against the unaccountableness of the Sovereign ; and so strikes at another Fundamental of our Constitution. And if a Man will hearken only to one side of the Question, and magnify and elaborately harangue upon all the Advantages of his own Scheme, and either silently pass by the contrary Mischiefs of it, or perhaps set himself with all his Skill to palliate and lessen them to a great degree, whilst the other are embellished with all the Ornaments of Rhetorick and Oratory, he may argue at least as plausibly for an *Elective Kingdom*, as for *Resistance in some cases*. He may plead that it is not fit the Crown should ever fall to a *Minor*, who not being capable of managing his own Affairs, nor entrusted by Law with those of the meanest Subject, ought therefore by no means to have any concern in those of a whole Kingdom. For how can the People expect to be governed in this case ? And what intolerable Mischiefs, what almost inevitable Destruction must they be exposed

fed to? Or if he is not a *Minor*, but is however a Person of weak Understanding, and perhaps of an inflexible Obstinacy with it, as too commonly happens, what a condition must his Subjects be in? And do not they deservedly suffer all the Evils that shall befall them, if they will be content to let such an one take the Reins of Government into his hands? Or again, the Case may be yet worse, if they have one who is set upon doing all the Mischief he can in his private Capacity, and cannot therefore be thought likely to be a tolerable Governor of the Society; indeed from whom nothing can be looked for but Folly and Wickedness, Cruelty and Oppression, and an unbounded Tyranny. Yet such must be expected to succeed sometimes in Hereditary Kingdoms. Wherefore were it not abundantly better, in all respects, for the People to choose some one from amongst themselves, whom by long Experience they have known to be a Person of Prudence, Conduct, Judgment, Temper, Piety, Diligence, Sagacity, Integrity, and all other Qualifications necessary for that high Office; one that understands the nature of his Undertaking, and will not only apply himself to it uprightly and indefatigably, but will be able to promote the Happiness and Welfare of the People to the utmost advantage? Such a Sovereign would be an Honour, an Ornament to his Kingdom; and under his *Shadow* and wise Administration, they might *live* and flourish amongst the Nations. This were a plausible Insinuation, and likely enough to take with such as had not well considered the dire Consequences that frequently attend such Elections. But whosoever seriously observes the divers Evils and Inconveniences to which an Elective Kingdom is liable beyond what usually attend an Hereditary Monarchy, and particularly shall take a view of *Poland* at this time, and *Hungary* too, if he pleases, may soon be convinced how little reason there is to wish for such a Change. Yet Mr. *H.*'s way of setting up the *Publick Good* against the Laws, may by others be urged, as I said, no less plausibly against an Hereditary Government; such as ours has always been

owned to be. So a Man may argue that a Popular Government is to be preferred before Monarchy, and seem to have some Reason on his side, whilst he insists only on its Advantages, without turning his eye to the much greater, that are certainly on the other side. Which yet upon an impartial view would quickly turn the scale, and shew these Pretences to be of no consideration in comparison of the vast Disadvantages whereto they are liable; besides that they are contrary to our Laws, and the Nature of our Constitution. The truth is, *Publick Good* is what every one is pleased to make it, and easily twisted and turned to serve whatever Purposes a popular Orator shall think proper to apply it to. But if seriously and thoroughly considered, must stoop to the Laws and Constitution, and is best promoted by a constant and regular observance of what they direct, provided they be such as are no way inconsistent with the Laws of God.

4. I find in Mr. H.'s Preface, p. xxvi. it had been objected by some, that when we speak of *Publick Good*, we must consider what is the Good, not of one Particular Kingdom, but what is the Good of Human Society or the World in general. And no doubt the Good of the Whole, is to be preferred before that of any of its Members. We have an odd Maxim in our Law, but which has more of Reason in it, than perhaps may at first be imagined, *Better a Mischief than an Inconvenience*. The Meaning is, that a Particular Mischief, which though heavy where it falls, is yet rarely felt, is rather to be born with, than a far less, but more general Inconvenience, and which may be expected to happen frequently. And the reasonableness of this Rule is attested by daily Experience. Now what single Persons are to a whole Community, that particular Communities are to the whole World. And no cause therefore can be assigned, why the same Doctrine should not by parity of Reason hold there too; that is to say, why Non-resistance, if for the Good of the Whole, should not be enjoined and practised, though it were supposed, as I cannot suppose it, *not* to be for the Good of any particular Society. This
Mr.

Mr. *H.* undertakes to answer ; but I would beg of him to look over his Preface again, and see whether he really thinks he has answered it. He tells us first, *Whatsoever is for the Good of this Nation in particular, is for the Good of every Nation under the Sun, in all parallel cases.* Which is a quitting the Question he was to answer, and starting another in its stead. A small Fault (a) with Mr. *H.* The Objection was with respect to the World in general ; and he speaks only of particular Nations. And though he says *every Nation under the Sun*, he clearly speaks of each Nation as it is in itself, not as considered in relation to the Whole ; to which it is only as a particular Person or Member is to that whole Nation. And many things may be for the Good of a single Member, that may by no means be for the Good of the whole Body. As to have the Gout removed from the Foot, may be for the Good of the Foot. But for Mr. *H.* to say, if so, it will be for the Good of every gouty Foot under the Sun, will never prove that to repel it thence to the Stomach, or Head, can ever be for the Good of the Man whose Foot it is. And as a particular Member of a Society ought sometimes to bear with Hardships, put upon him, for instance, in an erroneous Judgment given in any Court of Law or Equity, or other the like case, rather than make a disturbance in the Nation, so may a particular People be under equal Obligation, to submit to some Hardships and Inconveniences, rather than any way disorder that larger Community of which themselves are but a part. Mr. *H.* says farther, *If they who object this mean, that every particular Action of this Nation must be considered, not only with relation to this Kingdom, but also to the whole World, at this rate we must not make War, nor enter into any Alliances, though never so necessary for our own Interest, unless it be for the Interest of all other Kingdoms, and even of our Enemies themselves.* Where it is plain he is got again from the Good of the Whole, to that of Particular Nations, considered as such, and not in regard to the relation they bear to the Whole.

(a) See the Finishing Stroke, p. 169.

Whole. So that in both Answers he has said nothing, in respect to the Good of the Whole as such, though this be the only Point he was to have spoken to. In short, it must needs be for the Good of the Whole, to have its several Members live as quietly and peaceably with each other, as may be. And by consequence, to teach a submissive and obedient Behaviour in each Nation, must be as much better with respect to the whole World, than to foment Jealousies and Dissatisfactions, and promote frequent Insurrections and Rebellions, as it is, for the Good of any particular Nation, to have each Family *studying to be quiet, and do their own business*, and live kindly and lovingly with one another, rather than that instead of thus promoting the Publick Happiness, they should be continually employed about their own intestine Animosities and Quarrels.

5. Mr. H. proceeds, *Much less can any Law be of force; which takes away from a whole Nation of Men, the Right of Self-defence and Self-preservation.* As if a Nation could not subsist without a liberty to destroy itself; the too common Effect of Resistance. But perhaps Mr. H. is deeply in love with the Polish Government, and thinks that Nation a very happy People, and in a most effectual way to preserve themselves; and so a tempting Copy for all others to write after. Or as if a People were much safer in their own Protection, than when Suffering in Obedience to the Divine Will, and a Faithful Dependance upon Almighty God, and his Promise, That (a) *all things shall work together for the good of them that love him.*

6. But yet he may venture to say, that it will be hard to produce any Passage out of the Laws, which takes away from this Nation all Liberty of Self-defence, in cases in which it may be sure of Ruin without it. Where what he means by the Nation's being sure of Ruin, without the Liberty of Self-defence, I do not rightly understand; nor how he comes so well acquainted with the Decrees of the Divine Providence, which he has so little to do with in all his

R

Scheme

(a) Rom. 8: 28;

Scheme, as to foreknow when a Nation is sure of Ruin without Resistance. But this I am sure of, that ~~this~~ (a) *the Sufferings of this present time, not being worthy to be compared with the Glory that shall be revealed hereafter*, it is very ill Policy to make the Peace and Welfare of our present State the main End of our Designs, preferring this short transitory Life, before the eternal Felicity of the other: Which yet every one does, who against the Laws both of God and Man, sets up for that Resistance, whereto the Apostle has so expressly annexed *Damnation*. This I say, upon Supposition of this Resistance being a ready way to make us happy here. But if it be likely to make us no happier a People, than it did our Fathers in the long Rebellion after -- 41, or than it does the *Poles* or *Hungarians* at present, I can see no reason, why any should venture to be damned for such a Deliverance, attended with these tempting Consequences.

7. He tells us, (b) *It is the Opinion of many who are more versed in our Law, than he can pretend to be, that there are many things in it, in favour of what he has advanced.* This is a very loose sort of Expression, and if rightly considered, amounts to nothing at all. He does not tell us who these *many* are, nor what the *many things* he speaks of, nor how far they *favour what he has advanced*. I readily yield it would be to the purpose, if he could produce any Law now in force in behalf of Resistance, and would let us see in what part of the Statute-Book it is to be found. But alas! this is mere Delusion, and groundless Pretence. For here is not so much as one Statute mentioned, not one Common-Law-Maxim cited, not one adjudged Case alledged; nor indeed one single Lawyer that is so much as pretended to *favour* it. All that he has to plead for himself, is a Passage out of *Bracton*, which imports the King to be a Tyrant, or in his Phrase *a Minister of the Devil*, when he throws aside the Laws, and resolves to Govern arbitrarily. And yet I have before shewn, that *Bracton*, notwithstanding these hard

hard words, does not encourage to rise up against and depose such a Prince, but to leave him rather to the Judgment of Almighty God. Wherefore I appeal to the Reader: Can any thing in the World be more vain, than to triumph upon such a slight Occasion, and cry out as Mr. H. does, *I find I have the Old Law on my Side*? when as yet he has no Law of his Side; nor does so much as pretend to alledge any thing more, than the Saying of one anonymous Lawyer, till I gave him a Name; and this one who openly declares against all Resistance. But it is Mr. H.'s way, to take things for granted without Proof, and which never can be proved. And if he pleases, he has my free Consent to value himself upon it as excessively as he can. But *this* he says, this Expression of an ill Prince's being *the Minister of the Devil*, doth as expressly take from Princes all Divine Authority, in all Instances of Injustice and Oppression, as any thing he has said can do. But now if one were to ask two short Questions, I cannot but suspect there would be some difficulty in returning a Rational Answer to them. What Power had *Bracton* to take from Princes all Divine Authority? Who gave him this Power? Next, if he did reckon himself to have *taken all Divine Authority from them*, how came he to allow them to remain still irresistible? I cannot see any such great difficulty in conceiving a Prince to be at the same time *the Minister of God*, by reason of his Commission from him, and *the Minister of the Devil*, with respect to the Abuse of it. And if Mr. H. can prove any Inconsistency in this, it would be kind in him to clear it up, for the Instruction of myself, and others, who are not so sharp-sighted as to make any such Discovery. Till this be done, I must conclude the only Reason why he has not offered at any such Proof, is in truth because he knew it could not be proved; and that his Reader ought therefore to take his Word for it; and not put him upon a Task that would be sure to be too hard for him.

8. He urges farther, that our Legislators have publickly appealed to the Original Contract, and argued from thence
 R 2 for

for the transferring their Allegiance. For my part, I do not presume to set up in opposition to Legislators, or the Acts passed by them. But my Business being only with Mr. H. I hope I may without offence take the liberty to enquire of him, where this *Original Contract* is to be found, and whether it be as express for Resistance, as the Statutes I have quoted are against it? With whom it was made? and When? and before what Witnesses? who was constituted Judge of the Breach of it? and Where the Records of it are to be consulted? *Idem est non esse, & non apparere.* Since no such Contract can be produced, common Reason will direct to look upon it as nothing: The talk of it may serve to amuse unthinking People, but it cannot possibly be of any use, so long as we know neither where to find it, nor what it is. For I can no way think myself bound to prefer an invisible Contract, before known and visible Statutes, especially to prefer it so far, as to venture my Eternal Salvation upon it.

9. He insists next upon the Repeal of a Declaration against taking Arms against the King, upon any Pretence whatsoever; and if he had thought fit, he might have added the Oaths too, so constantly taken from the times of Queen Elizabeth, and King James the First. Yet this amounts to no more, than that the People are not now required to bear that Testimony against Resistance, that they were formerly; and will never prove, that they ought not to believe it still as unlawful as ever, since none of the Laws that condemn it have ever been repealed, but stand in their full force and vigour.

10. But this is not all; for he adds, *It is manifest, that in all their late Proceedings, with respect to the Succession to our Crown, they have followed this Maxim, that the Publick Security is the Supreme Law.* Now if I should for once grant him this, I am not sensible of what Advantage it would prove to him, unless they had also enacted Resistance, as the only Means of Security, and repealed all the former Laws against it: Which not being done, we have incomparably better Grounds left us, to believe Resistance still contrary to the English Constitution,

tion, than he has to believe otherwise. This is and will be the Case, whilst the Statutes stand as they yet do, condemning all Resistance; without exception for any Circumstances, or any Misgovernment the Prince may be justly chargeable with.

Wherefore let any Person, not desperately under the power of Prejudice, weigh what is here suggested, and see how positive our Laws and Lawyers are against all Resistance; and it will be very surprizing, if after this he can perswade himself, that that little Mr. *H.* has offered, to so little, very little purpose, can possibly pass with him for a Proof of the Legality of it. The King's having none above him but G O D only, were enough to argue him accountable to none else. But when the Laws not only own and bear Testimony to his Sovereignty, but moreover declare the Power of the Sword to be his peculiar Prerogative, and make it Treason to levy any War against him, or any way coerce him, and especially to imagin his Death and Destruction; to talk yet of the Lawfulness of Resistance, only because *Bracton*, who was himself against it, once calls an ill Prince the *Minister of the Devil*, or for any other of the slight Reasons now mentioned, must necessarily denote too heady a Zeal for an Hypothesis, and too little regard for plain and unbiass'd Truth. So that it still remains undeniable, that all forcible Resistance of the Prince is irreconcilable to, and destructive of the *English* Constitution, and the Laws are evidently against it. Which was the Fourth Thing I undertook to prove.

C H A P. V.

Whether a patient Submission, and Non-resistance; be not preferable to Resistance upon divers Accounts?

ALL that remains, is in the last place to compare the Advantages of Resistance and Non-resistance; and see whether the latter is not to be preferred before the former, and upon what Accounts,

counts. And this I presume will be very apparent; if I shall be able to make it out, that Non-resistance is

I. *More pleasing to Almighty GOD.*

II. *More becoming our Holy Profession.*

III. *A likelier Method of Preserving, and Propagating Religion.*

IV. *A surer Course of obtaining Eternal Happiness hereafter: And withal, is*

V. *Not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the Generality of the World are apt to imagin.* These are such singular Advantages of Non-resistance, under whatsoever Circumstances, as must exceedingly recommend it, to all such as are sincerely desirous to please God here, or be for ever Happy with him in the highest Heavens hereafter. And yet that this is the true State of the Case, I think it no difficult matter to evince very clearly: For,

1. That Non-resistance is far more pleasing to Almighty GOD than the contrary, is manifest from the divers Injunctions of it we meet with in Scripture, and the terrible Vengeance threatned to the Refractory and Disobedient. It is not only more agreeable to the Meek and Passive Temper of Christianity, but is so necessary and essential a Part of it, that there is no deviating from it, without incurring GOD'S Wrath, possibly here in this World; but without a hearty and sincere Repentance, most certainly in the other. And indeed this is the proper Trial of our Obedience, when we suffer Injuries for Righteousness sake; when we see our selves in danger of having our Rights invaded by an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Prince, or perhaps already ravished from us. And to behave our selves Submissively and Dutifully in this Case, is the best Testimony we can give, that our Dependance is upon God, and that we are acted and governed by a Fear of His Holy NAME. This shews us heartily desirous to please him, when (c) *Non civium ardor prava jubentium,*

Non vultus instantis Tyranni

Mente quatit solidâ:

When

When neither the Violence of our Fellow-Subjects, nor the Menaces of an insulting Tyrant can affright us out of our Duty, and either make us comply with any Commands inconsistent with our Religion, or put us upon any undue Method for the Preservation either of our selves, or it : This is a Service highly acceptable to Almighty GOD, and such a Proof of our Fidelity, as he will be sure to take notice of, and for which we may justly expect to be plentifully rewarded by him. *This*, says the Apostle, *(d)* *is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God, endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently ? But if when ye do well and suffer for it, ye shall take it patiently, this is acceptable with God :* This he takes a particular notice of, as well suiting with his Will and Word, and that Pattern our Lord has set us; *who*, as it follows in the next Verse, *(e)* *suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps.* Nothing like this can be so much as pretended to have been any where in Scripture spoken, in favour of Resistance. And I cannot therefore but conclude it out of Question, whether of the two is more pleasing to Almighty GOD. Those who live at ease, and have nothing to complain of, want an Opportunity of giving full Proof of their Fidelity; and no wonder if they be not tempted to Resist, whilst Submission is for their present Advantage. But when we labour under strong Temptations to the contrary, and yet retain our Patience and Integrity, our Loyalty and Allegiance, then it is we rightly approve our selves to Almighty God. Hereby we in a particular manner shew ourselves the Followers of the meek and suffering *Jesus*, and entitle ourselves to the Blessedness he has condescended to promise to all such as suffer out of conscience of their Duty, and for Righteousness sake.

2. Non-resistance is more becoming our holy Profession : As every one must be sensible, who considers with himself how earnestly our Religion recommends

R 4

Humility

(d) 1 S. Pet. 19, 20, (e) Vers. 21.

Humility and Lowliness of Mind, Meekness and Peaceableness, and Selfdenial, and Contempt of the World; and a readiness to part with all Temporal Advantages, rather than offend Almighty God. For hence it is easy to collect, whether suits best with the Temper and Genius of the Gospel, a quiet, dutiful, and obedient; or an aspiring, impatient, and revengeful Spirit, as that of Resistance is. Christianity, if duly entertained, and attended to, would naturally incline us all, to be *patient towards all Men*, bearing undeserved Provocations with a Calmness and evenness of Mind, to be kind and courteous to such as have wronged and injured us, and even to render them Good for their Evil. It prescribes the softest and easiest ways of Application towards our very Enemies; that we try to win upon them by Benignity and Kindness; *heaping Coals of Fire upon their Heads*, to melt them into a Reconciliation. Hence says our Saviour to his two Disciples, *S. James and S. John*, when they would have called for Fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans; and alledged *Elias's* Example for it; (e) *Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of.* As if our Saviour should have said, you consider not what kind of Spirit spurs you on to this; not that which my Doctrine was intended to instil into you, a Spirit of Clemency, and Kindness, and Forgiveness. "The Course which you must take," says Dr. Hammond, (f) is that of Sweetness and Persuasiveness. *Ye know not* "how opposite this Exterminating Spirit is to the Design of my Coming," says Dr. Whitby. (g) Opposite indeed it is to the Nature of the Christian Religion: Which is a suffering Religion, and promises peculiar Rewards to such as can forgo their Earthly Security and Conveniences, their present Enjoyments and Possessions, and their dearest Friends and Relations for their Saviour's sake, as our Blessed Lord told *S. Peter* and his Fellow-Disciples: *S. Matth. 19. 27, 28. Then answered Peter and said unto him, behold we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have there-*

(e) S. Luke 9. 55.

(f) In loc.

(g) In loc.

therefore ? And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you that ye who have thus renounced all, and followed me in the regeneration, when the son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And again, in the next words, (h) Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting life. And now can any thing in the World be more opposite to such a merciful, and meek, and suffering Religion; and to such vast Encouragement as is here given to those who submit to be persecuted for Righteousness sake : Can any thing in the World, I say, be more opposite to this, than to teach Men never to suffer Persecution, but when they find themselves unable to prevent or remove it, by standing upon their own Defence; but to take up Arms for their own Preservation, and to divest their Prince of all his Rights and Dominions, how large soever, and of all the Advantages that belong to his high Station, rather than suffer themselves to be deprived of their own lesser Estates or Privileges ? *Defendenda religio est, &c.* says Lactantius, (i) Religion is to be defended, not by killing others, but dying ourselves for it; not by Fierceness, but Patience; not by Wickedness, but by Faith. — For if you will defend Religion by Blood, by Torments, by any thing that is evil, assure yourselves you do not defend, but pollute and defile it. And it is reasonable to believe, that when our Saviour so often speaks of enduring Persecution, and even the loss of Life, and all for his sake, he cannot be thought to mean, that his Disciples might take up Arms against their lawful Sovereign, to avoid all manner of suffering by him: When he directs those who are persecuted in one City, (k) to fly into another; this does not look like an Instruction to them, to stand up for themselves there, rather than escape for their lives, and lose all they should leave behind them. In a word, search the whole Gospel, and every Chapter and Verse of it, and if throughout the whole

(h) V. 29. (i) Instit. l. 5, c. 20. (k) S. Mat. 10, 23.

Whole there be no Encouragement for Resistance; but on the contrary, Patience, and Meekness, and Submission, and Suffering are frequently inculcated, and we are there from time to time commanded, (l) *to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates; and this (m) not ~~only~~ only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake; (n) to submit ourselves to every Ordinance of Man for the LORD's sake; whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governors, as unto those that are sent by him; (o) to honour the King, &c.* Who that reflects upon these Passages, can ever imagin Submission and Resistance to be both of them agreeable to the Nature and Design of Christianity? Who can reconcile Opposition to Authority to these Texts? But especially who, after this, can possibly perswade himself, that (p) *a Passive Non-resistance would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of GOD, than the contrary?* It is as clear as the Sun, that to be submissive and obedient, not only to good and gentle Rulers, but also to the froward and perverie, to cruel and merciless Princes, resembles more the Carriage of our Blessed Lord, (a) *Who was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearers is dumb, so opened he not his mouth;* than to be tumultuous, and self-willed, and resolve not to be conquered, were this to be prevented by whatsoever Means; that to suffer the loss of all in Obedience to our Lord's Command, gives a better Title to the Promises of the Gospel, than seeking the Preservation of whatsoever temporal Advantages, by a forcible Resistance; and again, that to forsake Enjoyments, or Relations, or whatever is most valuable here, for the sake of a good Conscience, and to avoid Damnation, is a much better Sign of our conversation being in Heaven, and that our Affections are set on things Above, and not on things on the Earth; than fighting, and contending, and breaking through the Laws both of GOD and Man to secure them, can possibly be.

And

(l) Tit. 3. 1. (m) Rom. 13. 5. (n) 1 S. Pet. 2. 13, 14.
 (o) V. 17. (p) Measures of Submission, p. 8. (a) Acts 8. 32.

And as this shews, ^{us} far more like our Blessed Saviour than the contrary, and more observant of his Commands; so is it more for the Honour of our Religion, which it sets forth in the greater Lustre: It lets the World see by our Practice, both how peaceable the Precepts of the Gospel are, and what Influence its Promises and Threatnings will be sure to have, upon those who duly attend to it; that it can raise its Professors above this World and all its Temptations, and can produce that happy Effect, which *Cacilius*, in *Minutius Felix*, objects to the Christians of his time, as a Weakness in them, that *(b) The fear of dying hereafter, makes them not afraid to suffer Death at present.* It satisfies every body, how quiet, and how secure from all Treasons and Rebellions, each Nation would be, if the Doctrine of Religion had but got the Ascendent over Flesh and Blood; and that all the Seditious Insurrections in the World proceed from a want of Faith, and Trust in GOD, and Obedience to his Divine Laws. It would make it visible to all, what excellent Rules our Lord has prescribed us, and how greatly a due observance of them, would tend to the Peace and Happiness of Mankind. *Nothing contributes more*, as the devout Bishop *Beveridge* speaks, *(a) to the Honour and Glory of God's great Name, than the Meekness, Patience, and Peaceableness of those who profess the Religion, that our Lord Christ hath established in the World; because it shews the great Power and Force that his Religion hath upon the Minds of Men, to keep their Passions in order, to make them loyal and submissive to their Prince, as well as just and charitable to one another. Whereas if they who call themselves Christians, should be heady and high-minded, Traytors and Rebels against their King, and disturb the Peace of the Country where they live, this would reflect mightily upon our Lord, as if he had established a Religion in the World, which turned all things upside down, wheresoever it came. For ignorant and foolish Men, as the greatest part of Mankind are, will be apt to impute*

(b) Dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent. *Min. Fel.* p. 80.

(a) *Vol. X. Sermon. 13. p. 415, 416.*

impute all the Miscarriages of those who profess the Christian Religion, to the Religion they profess. This is the reason that the Apostle here gives, why this Command should be so religiously observed; For so, saith he, is the Will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the Ignorance of foolish Men; that is, God is pleased strictly to command you to submit yourselves to every Ordinance of Man, that so by this means you may stop the Mouths of those who would otherwise upbraid you for a company of turbulent and factious People, and charge your Religion with being the cause of Riots and Tumults in the State, which would be a mighty Dishonour to our Lord himself: And therefore you must needs be subject for his sake. Nothing gives a greater Blow to the Honour and Reputation of Religion, than the ill Lives of its Professors; and as in other respects, so more particularly as to Disobedience to Authority. And on the contrary, nothing tends more to its Credit and Advantage, than the careful and conscientious Deportment of its Professors, when our Light shines so before Men, as that they seeing our good Works, may hereby be induced to glorify our Father which is in Heaven. And thus it appears how much properer and more becoming our most holy Profession a dutiful Non-resistance is, than a contrary Opposition to, and Resistance of the Higher Powers. It is likewise,

3. A likelier method of preserving and propagating our Religion. The principal Plea for Resistance of Authority is, the Security of the true Religion. And were it lawful upon any account to Resist, it must be for this; because of the mighty Concern Religion is of, to all that desire everlasting Happiness, beyond all the transitory Enjoyments of this World. Yet even to preserve our Religion we may not Resist, this being neither a lawful, nor a probable way to preserve it.

Having shewn the Unlawfulness of Resistance upon whatever Accounts, it necessarily follows, that even the Preservation of Religion cannot make it Lawful; and for this plain Reason, that this were only to do evil for a good End; and what a Character the Apostle sets upon

upon this every one knows. (a) *And not rather, says the Apostle, as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, let us do evil, that good may come ; whose Damnation is just.*

And as it is not a lawful, so neither is it a probable means of securing our Religion. For this Security depends upon the good Providence of God, who orders all things according to the good Pleasure of his own Will, and without whom no Success is to be expected. He may, and often doth permit Wickedness to prosper for a while ; but this is more than can be any way depended upon. And in this particular Case, he many times, for wise and good Ends, suffers his Church and Faithful Servants to be under Affliction, and Tribulation, and lets their Enemies rage against them. Yet I believe every one will acknowledge, that the likeliest way to procure a Redress, is to please God, and not wilfully to offend him. And accordingly it is observable, that Religion always loses ground by Sin, but never by the patient and christian Sufferings of its Professors. This *Tertullian* insists upon as a truth, that their Persecutors ought to have attended to, it being a matter well deserving their serious Consideration, that all their Severities instead of lessening did but add to their Numbers. *Nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quæq; crudelitas, &c.* (b) Do your worst, as Mr. Reeves has very significantly translated this Passage, *Do your worst, and rack your Inventions for Tortures for Christians, 'tis all to no purpose ; you do but attract the World, and make it fall the more in love with our Religion ; the more you mow us down, the thicker we rise ; the Christians Blood you spill, is like the Seed you sow, it springs from the Earth again, and fructifies the more.* So also says *Justin Martyr*, (c) Though we be Beheaded, Crucified, exposed to the Beasts, to Bonds, and the Fire, and to all other sorts of Torture, it is nevertheless very apparent, that we not only depart not from our Profession of the Faith, but moreover by how much the more severely we are handled, so many the more faithful and devout Christians

Christians are there. And at another time, (d) The Christians being daily punished, do yet abound the more. And again, (e) Do ye not see that so many more as there are employed to punish us, so much the more do our Numbers increase? And to the same purpose speak (f) Lactantius, (g) Gregory Nazianzen, (h) S. Jerome, (i) S. Augustin in divers places.

And no wonder a State of Persecution should have this happy effect, it being natural for those that suffer to a great degree, to meet with the Compassion of the Beholders, who are apt to have the more favourable Opinion wrought in them of the Doctrine they see thus wonderfully attested by the Tortures and Death of its Professors. And this tempts them to enquire into the nature of it, and try what secret Virtue they can discover in it, that should produce such a firm adherence to it, in defiance of all the utmost Barbarities that at any time are executed upon them. The Faith, and Patience, and other noble Virtues that so illustriously shine forth in those who follow our Saviour to the Death, are of singular Efficacy for disposing others to hearken to and embrace the Truths they suffer for. They must needs conclude these patient, and yet undaunted Sufferers to be

(d) Ep. ad Diognet. (e) Ibid.

(f) Cum autem noster numerus semper Deorum cultoribus augeatur; nunquam vero, ne in ipsa quidem persecutione minuatur. *Instit. l. 5. c. 13.*

(g) Τοῖς περλαβέει διωγμοῖς — οἱ πρῶτῳ τῶν ἁγίων ἡ ἀδελφείῃ, ῥώσαντες τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς ἀσέβειαν, καὶ ὁπότε σιδήρῳ θερμῷ ὑπὸ τῶν κινδύνων σωμαίνοντες. *Orat. 3. adv. Julian. p. 72.*

(h) Persecutionibus crevit, martyriis coronata est, nempe Ecclesia. *Ep. 62. ad Theoph.*

(i) Ligabantur, includebantur, cædebantur, torquebantur, urebantur, laniabantur, trucidabantur, & multiplicabantur. *De civ. Dei. l. 22. c. 6.* Ad multiplicandam Ecclesiam valuit sanctus sanguis seminatione. *In Psal. 40. p. 247.* Multiplicati sunt magis magisque Christiani, & non est impletum quod dixerunt inimici, quando morietur, & peribit nomen ejus? *ibid.* De sanguine occisorum tanti exsurrexerunt à quibus illi interfectores martyrum superarentur. *In Psal. 134.*

be fully persuaded of the truth of what they are willing to seal with their dearest Blood ; because otherwise it is not imaginable they would choose to endure all this Shame and Pain, rather than renounce their Profession, and thereby set themselves at liberty. And (k) this inclines them to think it may be their own truest Interest to take the same course, and venture to be ruined as to all that is dear in this World, rather than miscarry everlastingly in the other. The Blood is one of the three Witnesses that appear for Christ upon Earth, as (l) S. John tells us ; and it has a very attracting power, and proves many times of great use for adding to the number of his Disciples. Instead of affrighting People from the Faith, it has ordinarily a quite contrary Tendency, and makes them the more in love with it.

But it is much more considerable, that God Almighty is ready by his good Spirit to cherish and encourage any such Beginnings, and make them effectual for *adding to the Church such as shall be saved*. He knows very well how to over-rule all the Purposes and Thoughts of Men to his own Ends, though far beyond what they at first designed. And hence it comes to pass that the Persecuting of Christianity, whilst its Professors submit and suffer as he requires of them, becomes a means of its Propagation, and makes People more eager and vigorous in the Profession of it. So that Religion itself is never like to be extirpated by Persecution, unless its Professors fail of performing their Duty as they ought, whilst under these Tryals, or otherwise provoke God to deliver them up, by whatsoever Transgression or Neglect of their Duty in other respects.

And as to the Privileges and outward Advantages attendant upon it, it is not so certain that these will suffer

(k) Nec ramen deficiet hæc secta ; quam tunc magis ædificari scias, cum cædi videtur. Quisq; enim tantam tolerantiam spectans, ut aliquo scrupulo percussus, & inquirere accenditur, quid sit in causa ; & ubi cognoverit veritatem, & ipse statim sequitur. *Tertull. ad Scap.* in fine.

(l) 1 Epist. 5, 8.

fer much by them. For God has many ways to deliver his Servants out of their Distress, and grant them Ease and Safety, when neither Themselves nor their Persecutors think of it. He has a watchful Eye over them, and oftentimes preserves them by unforeseen, and in all appearance improbable means. And this perhaps when upon the very point of Destruction.

Thus he delivered the *Jews* (m) in *Ahasuerus's* time, out of the very Jaws of Death, when the Day was set for their Extirpation, and the Orders for it already given; and all by means of poor *Mordecai*, whom one would have thought a very mean Instrument, for bringing about so wonderful an Escape.

At another time they were almost miraculously saved in the days of *Caligula*; (n) when upon repeated Orders to ^{Pet}*petronius*, whom he had sent with an Army into *Judea*, to set up his Statue in the Temple, with commission to slay such as should oppose it, and to take the rest of the Nation Captives, yet in these uncomfortable Circumstances they were however preserved. Their humble Submission and Prayers for the Emperor, together with their Readiness to dye rather than either resist their Sovereign, or violate their Law in compliance with his unjust Demands, wrought so powerfully upon ~~Caligula~~ ^{Pet}*petronius* that he forbore to put his Orders in execution, and ventured at the peril of his Life to entreat the Emperor's Mercy towards them. But this Clemency and Compassion in him gained them only a short delay: For a severe and angry Answer was immediately dispatch'd, threatening him with Death for having so long neglected to perform what was commanded. And now what hope of Rescue remained for a People thus inexorably devoted to Destruction? They could not expect ~~Caligula~~ ^{Pet}*petronius*, though very kind to them, would yet offer himself a Sacrifice for them.† Or if he had, they could hope for but a little respite by it, till some other General, less merciful than he, should be sent in his stead. Yet now in their lost undone Condition, when no hope of

(m) *Esth.* 4. 1, &c.

(n) *Josep. Iud. Antiq. l. 2. c. 10.*
Et Antiq. l. 18. c. 11.

† *Josephus de Bello Judaico l. 2. c. 10. §. 6.* did offer to lay down his life for y^e Jews; saying, *ἡ γὰρ τὸ θεῶν συνεργῶντος πείσας καὶ σάρα*

of Safety was left, behold the wonderful Goodness of God to his faithful and submissive People ! The Courier that was to bring these destructive Orders, was fortunately stopt at Sea, till another arrived before him with the News of the Emperor's Death, and so put an end to this most execrable Design.

So *Lactantius* relates, (o) that when *Maximin* had vowed to *Jupiter*, utterly to extinguish the Christian Name, if he obtained the Victory against them as he expected ; upon *Licinius* and his Army's Prayer to God for Deliverance, *Maximin* with all his Forces, though incomparably more than the others, were presently mowed down, like Men dismayed and unable to help themselves. His whole Army was killed and routed, and himself forced to fly in a mean Disguise, to save his Life ; and those he had destined to Slaughter, were happily released from all their Fears.

In like manner when *Julian* setting out upon his Expedition into *Persia*, had determined, upon his return with the Victory and Triumph he had vainly promised himself, to fall severely upon the Christians, as *Theodoret* testifies, (p) and as the (q) *Centuriatores Magdeburgenses* relate from *Orosius*, had already commanded a Theatre to be built, wherein to expose the Bishops, Monks, and all the holy Men of the place, to the Claws and Teeth of the merciless Beasts, so that now they seemed to be in a desperate State, had it not been for that good Providence of God, which they had reason to believe, would not fail them in their great Necessity ; yet by his Mercy and Protection they were soon relieved, their Apostate Enemy being cut off in the Battle, and so never returning to satiate his Fury upon them.

And multitudes of other like Instances might be produced, to shew that it is not so easy a matter to discover, when a Nation is sure of being ruined without Resistance. Because God Almighty has a constant regard for his faithful Servants, that put their Trust in him, and frequently

S

(o) De mort. perfec. c. 46, 47.

(p) Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 21. (q) Cent. 4. cap. 3. p. 69.

quently works out Deliverance for them by sudden and unexpected means. So that it really is oftentimes nearest to them, when they have the least prospect of it. And I should always desire, as for myself, so also for my Country and Relations, and all I wish well to, that they may be rather under the Divine Protection, than their own; as being fully assured this is the best, the only Safety they can promise themselves, either for Themselves, their Enjoyments, or their Religion.

4. Non-resistance is a surer course for obtaining Eternal Happiness hereafter. This is the natural Result of all I have so largely discoursed, concerning the Unlawfulness and infinite Danger of Resistance. And it is what all Persons are nearly concerned to lay seriously to heart, weighing well with themselves how much the wisest course it would be for them, *to lay up to themselves Treasures in Heaven*, though by parting with all here if called to it, rather than insist upon the Maintenance and Preservation of their Temporal Rights and Liberties, with any the least danger of ruining themselves by it in the other World. Were it a doubtful matter, whether Resistance might be an impediment to our Eternal Welfare, the disparity that is betwixt the Bliss and Felicity of the other Life, and any thing that can be expected to be kept or got in this, is such; and again the Tortures and Agonies of the Damned in Hell are so infinitely beyond what the most outrageous Tyrant can inflict here; that they ought by no means to be put in competition with each other. But if the case be so plain, as that in truth there is no room left for questioning, whether *Damnation* be denounced to all Resisters of the Higher Powers, who would be so intolerably regardless of his own everlasting Salvation, as wilfully to incapacitate himself for it? As we are Christians, we have *Life and Immortality brought to light by the Gospel*, and so are sure of being either infinitely Happy, or infinitely Miserable for ever in a future State. And we must therefore be dreadful Enemies to our own Souls, if we will not be persuaded upon occasion to deny our selves some Temporal Conveniences, and undergo some

Hard-

Hardships and Difficulties, in pursuit of that never failing Crown of Glory, which our Lord has promised to him that *overcometh* in his Spiritual Warfare. Heaven and eternal Happiness are well worth all we can do or suffer in order thereto. And there is no Satisfaction on this side Heaven, comparable to that, of being able to say with S. Paul, (d) *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith, henceforth is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness, which God the righteous Judge, will give me at that day, the last and great Day, when our Lord shall appear to render to every man according to his doings.* This is the peculiar Advantage of a patient Submission to God's Will, and Acquiescence in whatsoever he thinks fit to lay upon us, whether by the Tyranny of an evil Governor, or any other way. And our Blessed Saviour tells us on the other hand, how sad and doleful the case will be with such as take a contrary course, namely, that they are not worthy of him, and by consequence are sure not to be owned and glorified by him hereafter. (a) *If any man come to me, and hateth not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Sisters, yea and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple: And whosoever doth not bear his Cross and come after me, cannot be my Disciple.* And a little after, (b) *Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my Disciple.* And again, (c) *If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross, and follow me: For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.* Of such unconceivable and infinite Concern is it to us, to slight, and undervalue, and be ready to be stript of all temporal and worldly Advantages and Enjoyments, rather than use any unlawful means for preserving them. And for our Encouragement it may be farther remembred, and it is the last Consideration I mentioned, that,

5. Non-resistance is not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the generality of the World
S 2
are

(d) 2 Tim. 4. 7, 8.

(a) S. Luke 14. 26, 27, (b) V. 33, (c) S. Mat. 16. 23, 24.

are apt to imagine ; I mean in respect to our own selves. I have severall times hinted, that I cannot think Resistance to be for the Benefit of the Publick, though I have studiously forbore to enter upon that Controversy, as reckoning it much more to my purpose to shew the Sin of Resisting, and the infinite Danger of it in relation to another Life. But besides this, it is worthy our Consideration, that Persecution for Religion and a good Conscience, and a Sense of Duty to Almighty God, and a Desire of being eternally Happy with him in Heaven, is not so insupportable a Burden, as it is wont to appear to such as have never tried it. I grant it is no easy matter to be divested of one's own Possession, and all means of Subsistence for himself and his Family, to be forsaken by divers of his old, and perhaps most intimate Acquaintance, to be frequently alarmed with Fears and Dangers of some farther Severity, to be Imprisoned, Outlawed, and it may be put to Death, for not complying with the sinful Commands of a tyrannical Governor. But yet the good Christian meets with inestimable Supplies of Grace and Comfort under these Tryals, and can heartily rejoice to think that the greater his Sufferings are, so much the greater Recompence may he expect, if he but acquit himself aright under them. He knows they cannot possibly last long ; and that if he has no other Release from them, yet at least the Grave, which we are sure is not at any considerable distance, will effectually put an end to them. *(a) There the wicked cease from troubling ; and there the weary are at rest : There the prisoners rest together, they hear not the voice of the Oppressor ; the small and great are there, and the servant is free from his master.* And when once the Christian Sufferer is lodged in this cold Apartment, his Hardships are all over, and nothing thenceforward to be met with, but the most transporting Felicity, Joy, Love, and Light, and Splendor, and Majesty, and the Eternal Enjoyment of God himself, and our Blessed Saviour and Redeemer, and the perpetual Society of all the holy Angels, *and the Spirits of Just Men*

(a) Job 3. 17, 18, 19.

Men made perfect, or whatever can contribute to make him unspeakably, unconceivably, and infinitely happy for evermore.

And in the mean time, though his Circumstances are straight, and his Fortune much reduced, and himself hereby forced to take up with a different meaner sort of Life than he had been formerly acquainted with, yet possibly he may not be stript of all; and so may enjoy himself with a great deal of Satisfaction in his narrower Lodgings, with his courser Fare, and threadbare Cloaths; and can bless himself to think, that he has learned with *S. Paul*, *(b)* both how to be abased, and how to abound; and every where, and in all things is instructed, both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. He finds some Advantages in his Retirement that he wanted before, and which therefore help to make it the more agreeable to him. He has himself and his time more at his own command, is not overburdened with Company, is not envied by his Neighbours, is out of the way of divers Temptations whereto a more publick Station is liable, is in less danger of being overfond of this present Life and World, and can so much the more willingly quit it whensoever he shall be summoned hence. And these, and other the like Considerations, he will be sure to improve to his own advantage, till by degrees he makes all his Losses or whatever Sufferings not only tolerable, but easy to him.

Or suppose him reduced to a lower State, so as to live upon the Charity of well-disposed Christians, and withal that this comes in but slowly, and so his Wants are very pinching; yet still *his Heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord*, who he finds does not so forsake him in his Distress, but that he sometimes meets with Compassion and Relief: And when he does, it is a singular pleasure to him to observe the hand of God thus seasonably administering to his Necessities, supplying his Wants, and lightning his Burden when he is most pressed, and almost born down with it. An unexpected Kindness in such Circumstances, is an admirable Cordial to his
tired

tired Spirits; and lets him experimentally see, how happy that Man is whose Hope is always in the Lord, and who has learned invincibly to depend upon him. And beyond all this, he feels the Assistances of God's good Spirit upholding him when most in danger of sinking; and enjoys such an ^{and} inward Calm and Serenity of Mind, is so composed, satisfied, and has such an Affiance in God, and such *Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost*, as he would not exchange for all the World. And if he be called to suffer Death for the Name of Christ, or for a firm Adherence to his Duty in whatever respect, he can readily resign his Soul to God who gave it, in full assurance of an abundant Reward thenceforward to be conferred upon him, when *his light Affliction, which is but for a moment, shall have wrought out for him a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of Glory*. In his utmost Extremities, and the greatest Hardships he is at any time reduced to, he knows he has a Good GOD to rely upon, who will not totally cast him off, but will be with him, to bless and provide for him at present, and to crown him with eternal Felicity hereafter. Which is such an invaluable Privilege, as may well take off the Edge of the sharpest Trials that can possibly assault him, and will make him with the Apostles, (a) *more than Conqueror, through him that loveth him*.

Which whosoever duly observes, must needs be convinced, that Suffering upon a Good Account is a far easier Task than it is usually represented to be, and especially by such as have an aversion to it. If a Draught of it be taken only from the Inconveniences that attend it, its Sights and Contempt, its Poverty and Wants, its Racks and Gibbets, &c. so I confess it will have no pleasing Aspect; and no marvel if some be terrified out of their Duty by it, when appearing in this frightful Dress. But let them only turn the other Side of the Table, and consider the Assistances and Comforts that are to be expected under it; and especially that inestimable everlasting Felicity, which is promised by the Gospel to all that suffer for our Saviour's sake; and they will

(a) Rom. 8. 37.

will presently see cause to have a very different Notion of it: They will quickly be convinced, that the worst that can befall them here is tolerable now, and will make them incomparably happy at last. Whilst on the other hand, any unlawful means for shaking off the Yoak, and preventing these Trials, may possibly meet with a cross Event here; but are sure beyond all doubt to be attended with an infinite Load of Misery in the World to come, for ever and ever.

C O N C L U S I O N.

AND now to come to a Conclusion of the Whole: Having considered the Insufficiency of Mr. H.'s Arguments, in behalf of the *Resistance he has taught*, and ~~and~~ shewn that they by no means prove it Lawful, much less a Duty *Honourable and Glorious*; and having on the other hand evinced the Unlawfulness and Iniquity of it, and that it stands condemned by all the Tests we have whereby to judge of the Rectitude or Obliquity of any Action of this Nature; and lastly, that the contrary Duty is more pleasing to God, more becoming our Profession as Christians, a surer Method for the Preservation of our Religion, a readier Way to eternal Happiness, and a much easier Task in itself, than some are desirous to have it thought; it can be no difficult matter to determine, whether of these two Courses is to be chosen. Wherefore I submit it to every one's Judgment, whether it be not far more suitable to the Doctrine of our most holy Religion, and more becoming the Disciples of a crucified Saviour, and who profess to take up their Cross and follow him, in hope of an eternal Enjoyment of him in Heaven, and in the mean time to have their Conversation there, and *live by Faith, and not by Sense*; whether, I say, it be not abundantly more becoming such as thus profess themselves Disciples of the Cross, and to hope for their Reward in another Life, to bear with Trials and Persecutions, and hard and unjust Usage at any time
from

from their Sovereign, than to take the Cause out of GOD's hand into their own, and thereby shew themselves the Followers of the Devil; whom our first *Homily against Rebellion* justly stiles, (a) *the First Author and Founder of Rebellion, and the grand Captain and Father of Rebels.* We are to remember that Patience and Submission, and a Resignation to the Divine Will, are not only more conducing to the Welfare and Happiness of this World, than the contrary boisterous and turbulent Passions, but they are of absolute Necessity in order to a better. And nothing can be more highly reasonable, than to prefer the invaluable and lasting Rewards of the other State, before the unsatisfactory, uncertain, transitory Enjoyments of this.

I shall shut up all, with the late learned Dean of S. Paul's, Dr. Sherlock, in the same Words wherewith he concludes his *Case of Resistance* of the Supreme Powers. *If you believe there is a Hell for Rebels and Traytors, the Punishment of Resistance is infinitely greater, than all the Mischiefs which can befall you in Subjection to Princes, and a patient Suffering for Well-doing. What shall it profit a Man, if he shall gain the whole World, and lose his own Soul? Though an Universal Empire were the Reward of Rebellion, such a glorious Traitor who parts with his Soul for it, would have no reason to boast much of his Purchase. Let us then reverence the Divine Judgments, let us patiently submit to our Prince, though such should persecute and oppress us; and expect our Protection here from the Divine Providence, and our Reward in Heaven. Which is the same Encouragement to Non-resistance, which we have to the Practice of any other Virtue. Were the Advantages and Disadvantages of Resistance and Non-resistance in this World fairly estimated, it were much more eligible to submit, than to rebel against our Prince; but there can be no comparison between these two, when we take the other World into the Account. The last Judgment weighs down all other Considerations; and certainly Rebellion may well be said to be as the Sin of Witchcraft, when it so enchants Men, that they are resolved to be Rebels, though they be Damned for it.*

F I N I S.

A Catalogue of Books referred to in
the two Parts of this Answer.

A.

- A**lteserra in Anastasium. *Par.* 1680.
B. Ambrosii Opera. *Col. Agrip.* 1616.
Ammianus Marcellinus. *Hamb.* 1609.
Bishop Andrews on the Commandments. *Lond.* 1641.
*Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testa-
ment by certain learned Divines, &c.* *Lond.* 1657.
*Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Case of Allegiance
due to Sovereign Powers.* *Lond.* 1692.
Tho. Aquinatis Summa Theologica. *Parif.* 1632.
Aristotelis Opera. *Lugd.* 1590.
——— De Rhetorica. *Lond.* 1619.
Arnobius adversus Gentes. *Lugd. Bat.* 1651.
S. Athanasii Opera. *Parif.* 1627.
Athenagoras. *Lut. Par.* 1615.
B. Augustini Opera. *Basil.* 1529.

B.

- D**R. Barrow's Works. *Lond.* 1687.
S. Basilii Magni Opera. *Parif.* 1637.
Bellarminii Disputationes. *Lut. Par.* 1620.
Bernard's Clavi trabales. *Lond.* 1661.
Beveregii Synodicon. *Oxon.* 1672.
——— *Private Thoughts upon Religion.* *Lond.* 1709.
——— *Sermons; Vol. X.* *Lond.* 1710.
Theod. Beza in Novum Testamentum. *Gen.* 1588.
Bishop Bilson of Christian Subjection. *Oxford,* 1585.
Bishop Blackhall's Answer to Mr. Hoadly's Letter. *Lond.*
1709.

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

Mr. Blomer's Sermon in K. Hen. VII's Chapel. Lond.

1711.

Bocharti Phaleg. Cadom. 1651.

Bracton de Legibus & Consuetudinibus Angliæ. Lond.

1569.

Brady's Introduction to the English History. Lond. 1684.

Brown's Subjects Sorrow. Lond. 1711.

Budæi Commentarii Linguae Græcæ. Basil. 1556.

Bishop Burnet's Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland. Glasgow, 1673.

————— *Subjection for Conscience sake, asserted in a Sermon at Covent-Garden. Lond. 1679.*

————— *Sermon preached at the Chapel of the Rolls. Lond. 1684.*

————— *Life of Sir Matthew Hale. Lond. 1682.*

————— *History of the Reformation. Lond. 1681.*

————— *Two Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury. Lond. 1710.*

————— *Collection of Eighteen Papers. Lond. 1689.*

C.

D*R. Calamy's Sermon before the Artillery-Company. Lond. 1685.*

Callimachus. Ultrajeet. 1697.

Jo. Calvini Institutiones. Genev. 1617.

Cambdeni Hist. Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ. Lugd. Bat. 1625.

Case of Allegiance to the King in Possession. Printed 1690.

Its Vindication. 1691.

Julii Capitolini Clodius Albinus. Basil. 1546.

Dr. Cave's Primitive Christianity. Lond. 1672.

————— *Historia Literaria. Lond. 1688.*

Centuriatores Magdeburgenses. Basil. 1624.

Chamberlain's present State of England. In the Savoy, 1676.

King CHARLES's Works. Lond. 1662.

M. T. Ciceronis Opera. Basil. 1534.

B. Chrysostomi Opera. Atonæ, 1613.

Lord Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Oxford, 1702.

Clementis Alexandrini Opera. Lut. Par. 1641.

Sir

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

- Sir E. Coke's Reports.* Lond. 1670.
Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain. Lond. 1708.
Comenii Parænesis, &c. Amsterd. 1661.
Cotelerii Patres Apostolici. Lut. Par. 1672.
Cotton's Abridgment of the Tower-Records. Lond. 1679.
Cowell's Interpreter. Lond. 1637.
B. Cypriani Opera. Oxon. 1682.
S. Cyrilli Alexandrini Opera. Paris. 1638.
S. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani Opera. Oxon. 1703.

D.

- D***Avenantii Determinationes.* Cantab. 1634.
Defence of the Profession which John Lord Bishop of Chichester made upon his Death-bed. Lond. 1690.
Sir Dudley Diggs's Unlawfulness of the Subjects taking up Arms. Printed 1647.

E.

- E***Lord Chancellor Ellesmere's Speech touching the Postnati.* Lond. 1609.
Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject. Lond. 1706.
S. Epiphani Opera. Colon. 1682.
Estius in Epistolâs. Col. Agr. 1631.
Eucherii Lugdunensis Opera. In Bibliotheca Patrum. To. VI.
Eusebii Hist. Eccl. Lut. Par. 1541. & Col. Agripp. 1612.
Eutropius. In vitis Cæsarum. Basil. 1546.
Examination of the Arguments drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, and its Vindication. Lond. 1691.
Exercitation concerning Usurped Powers. Lond. 1650.

F.

- F***Alkner's Christian Loyalty.* Lond. 1679.
Fleta de Legibus Angliæ. Lond. 1647.
L. A. Flori Rerum Romanarum Epitome. Lond. 1692.
Fulk on the Rhemish Testament. Lond. 1601.

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

G.

THE Good Old Cause, or Lying in Truth. Lond. 1710.

Grail's Three Sermons preached at Norwich. Lond. 1685.

Gregorii Magni Opera. Basil. 1551.

Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera. Paris. 1630.

————— In Julianum Invektivæ. Etone. 1610.

Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Paris. 1638.

H. Grotius de Jure Belli ac Pacis. Amstelad. 1670.

————— De Imperio summarum Potestatum circa Sacra. Lut. Par. 1647.

————— Opera omnia Theologica. Amstelad. 1679.

Bishop Grove's Vindication of the Conforming Clergy, in answer to Mr. Jenkins. Lond. 1676.

H.

GEorgii Hakewill Scutum Regium. Lond. 1612.

Sir Matthew Hale's Pleas of the Crown. Lond. 1678.

Hammond's Works. Lond. 1684.

Hesychii Lexicon. Lugd. Bat. & Roterod. 1668.

Dr. Hickes's Jovian. Lond. 1683.

————— Harmony of Divinity and Law. Lond. 1684.

S. Hieronymi Opera. Col. Agripp. 1616.

Mr. Hoadly's Measures of Submission. Lond. 1706.

————— Preface to the Second Edition. Ibid. 1708.

————— Considerations humbly offered to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. Ibid. 1709.

————— Examination of the Patriarchal Scheme, and against Dr. Atterbury. Ibid. 1710.

Holinshead's Chronicles. Lond. 1577.

Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. Lond. 1635.

Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. Lond. 1602.

Horatii Flacci Opera. Lond. 1694.

J.

King James's Works. Lond. 1616.

Jenkinsius Redivivus. Lond. 1681.

Josephi 'Αρχαιολογία. Iud. Basil. 1544.

S. Irenæus contra Hæreses. Oxon. 1702.

Juliani

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

Juliani Opera. Lipsia, 1696.
Corpus Juris Civilis. Lugd. 1590.
Corpus Juris Canonici. Taurin. 1620.
Justin Martyris Opera. Lut. Par. 1615.
Juvenalis Satyræ. Lugd. Bat. 1671.

K.

K *Eble's Statutes. Lond. 1681.*
Kennet's Sermon before the Commons. Jan. 30. 1705.
Kettlewel's Duty of Allegiance settled upon its true Grounds.
1691.
 ——— *Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross. Lond.*
1691.

L.

L *Actantius de Mortibus Persecutorum. Traject. ad Rhe-*
num, 1692.
 ——— *Institutiones. Antv. 1539.*
Lambardus de priscis Anglorum legibus. Cantab. 1644.
Lesly's Rehearsals. Lond 1708.
Just. Lipsius de Cruce. Antwerp. 1606.
Tit. Livii Historiarum quod extat. Amstel. 1665.
Long's Unreasonableness of Rebellion, a Sermon at Exeter,
July 26. 1685. Lond. 1685.

M.

B *ishop Manningham's Six Sermons. Printed for W. Crook*
at the Green-Dragon without Temple-Bar.
March's Sermon at Newcastle, Jan. 30. 1676-7. Lond.
1677.
Martyre de la Reyne d' Escosse Douariere de France.
Anvers, 1588.
Dr. Meriton's Sermon at S. Martyn's, Jan. 30. 1660.
Milbourn's Measure's of Resistance. Lond. 1710.
 ——— *Melius inquirendum. Lond. 1709.*
Min. Felicis Octavius. Lugd. Bat. 1672.
Bishop More's Sermon at Guild-Hall Chapel. Lond. 1682.
Dr. Moss's Sermon before the House of Commons, Jan. 30,
1706. Lond. 1707.

N.

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

N.

Nichols's *Duty of Inferiours to Superiours*. Lond. 1701.

O.

Book of Oaths. Lond. 1689.

Oecumenii Commentaria. Lut. Par. 1671.

Optati Milevitani Opera. Paris. 1679.

Origenis Adamantii Opera. Johannis Parvi & Jod. Badii.

——— C. Celsum. Cantab. 1658.

P.

Palladius de Vita S. Chrysostomi. Lut. Par. 1680.

Bishop Parker's Religion and Loyalty. Lond. 1684.

S. Paul no Mover of Sedition. Lond. 1706.

Velleius Paterculus. Antv. 1627.

Phavorini Lexicon. Basil. 1538.

Philoxeni aliorumq; veterum Authorum Glossaria. Lugd. Bat. 1600.

Du Pin's Nouvelle Bibliotheque jouxte la copie à Paris, 1690.

M. A. Plauti Comœdiæ. Lugd. Bat. 1669.

Plea for Nonsubscribers. Lond. 1650.

Plea of Publick Good, &c. Lond. 1706.

C. Plinii Secundi Epistolæ, &c. Genev. 1643.

Plutarchi Opera. Lut. Par. 1624.

M. Poli Synopsis Criticorum. Lond. 1669.

Polidori Vergilii Historia Anglica. Basil. 1534.

Julii Pollucis Onomasticon. Amstelæd. 1706.

S. Polycarpi Epistola, & Martyrium. Oxon. 1709.

Prosperi Aquitanici Opera. Col. Agrip. 1609.

Prudentii Opera. Amsterod. 1625.

R.

Reves's Apologies of Justin Martyr, &c. Lond. 1709.

Bp. Robinson's Sermon at St. James's, Mar. 8. 1710.

The Royal Apology. Lond. 1684.

S.

DR. Sacheverel's Sermon at St. Paul's, Nov. 5. 1709.
Lond. 1709. Salviani

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

Salviani Opera. *Par.* 1669.

Sanderfonus de Obligatione Conscientiæ. *Lond.* 1686.

————— *Sermons.* *Lond.* 1689.

L. An. Senecæ Opera. *Antv.* 1632.

Sheringham's *King's Supremacy asserted.* *Lond.* 1682.

Dr. Sherlock's *Case of Resistance.* *Lond.* 1690.

————— *Case of Allegiance considered.* 1691.

Sigonius de antiquo jure civium Romanorum. *Hanov.* 1609.

Socrates & Sozomenus. *Lut. Par.* 1541.

Ælius Spartianus; in vitis Cæsarum. *Basil.* 1546.

Hen. Stephani Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ. *Par.* 1572.

Bishop Stillingfleet's *Origines Britannicæ.* *Lond.* 1685.

Strangvage's *History of Mary Q. of Scotland.* *Lond.* 1624.

Suetonii Tranquilli Cæsares. *Lugd.* 1544.

Suidas. *Col. Allobr.* 1619.

Surius de vitis Sanctorum. *Col. Agr.* 1576.

Symmonds's *Loyal Subjects Belief.* *Oxford,* 1643.

Synesii Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1631.

T.

C. Taciti Opera. *Antv.* 1627.

Terentii Comœdiæ. *Roterod.* 1670.

Tertulliani Opera. *Lutet.* 1634.

Theodoreti Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1642.

————— *Hist. Eccl. Paris. Rob. Steph.* 1541.

Theophilus Antiochenus. *Lut. Par.* 1615.

Thompson's *Sermon in the Cathedral at Bristol,* June 21, 1685. *Lond.* 1685.

✓ *Title of a Thorough-Settlement examined.* *Lond.* 1691.

Tyndale's *Translation of the Bible.* Printed A. D. 1549.

V.

A Urelius Victor; in Romanæ Historiæ Epitome. *Amstelod.* 1625.

Vincentii Lyrinensis *Commonitorium.* *Paris.* 1669.

Ger. Jo. Vossii *Rhetorice contracta.* *Lugd. Bat.* 1627.

A. B. Usher's *Power of the Prince.* *Lond.* 1688.

Vulcatius Gallicanus; in vitis Cæsarum. *Basil.* 1546.

W.

A Catalogue of Books referred to, &c.

W.

Bishop Wake's *Sermon before the House of Peers.* Lond.
1708.

B. Waltoni Biblia Polyglotta. Lond. 1657.

Bishop Ward's Seven Sermons. Lond. 1674.

Dr. Welton's Sermon before the Lieutenantcy, Nov. 19. 1710.
Lond. 1710.

Bishop Weittenhal's Hexapla Jacobæa. Dublin, 1686.

*Dr. Whitby's Paraphrase and Comment upon the New
Testament.* Lond. 1703.

Y.

Lord Archbishop of York's *Sermon before the House of
Peers.* Lond. 1700.

X.

Xiphilini *Epitome Histor. Dionis.* Par. 1551.

A
L E T T E R
T O A
C L E R G Y - M A N :

Concerning
Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine,
A B O U T
The Homilies, and Resistance.

By m^r Stamp.

~~*By another Hand. See p. 211.*~~

Fortem animum præstant rebus, quas turpiter audent.

L O N D O N :

Printed in the Year M DCC XI.

Handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to fading and the texture of the paper.

By the way

Handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to fading and the texture of the paper.

To the R E A D E R.

I Had not put thee under the unmerciful Penance of Reading an Argument to prove that the Sun shines, had not the Person to whom the Letter is directed, unfairly broken the solemn Agreement made between us, and used me neither like a Friend, a Gentleman, nor a Christian. The Condition of my Writing was, that the Knowledge and Perusal of what I have written, and of his Reply to it, should be confined to a few select Hands. But he no sooner receives my Letter, but he immediately reviles it in all Companies, and cries out upon it as a Furious Paper, merely upon the Account of a little (not indecent) Severity in it; for which I hope I may be excused, since it was wrote for a Cause, in which this Gentleman gives Himself the Lie, and all

To the Reader.

the Clergy of the Kingdom, who are not of His, and his Master Hoadly's Opinion. For so doth every one who pleads, that the Homilies are reconcilable with Resistance in Any Case, and for Any Cause whatsoever. Nothing of this Nature had ever been Published by me, had he not forced me to it, by his unjust and unreasonable Clamours against the Author, passionately reproaching and inveighing against me, without any other Provocation given; openly declaring withal, that the Bishop of the Diocese was made acquainted with it. And the Brachium Seculare (an excellent Second) is called upon for his Assistance. This is the Case in short, judge of it, and of the Letter; and so I bid thee heartily farewell.

S. Luke's Day, 1710.

Reve-

Reverend Sir !

IN our late Discourse, in which I defended Absolute *Passive Obedience* to the Rightful King or Queen of this Realm; and you, an Obedience only Partial, qualified, or discretionary, I told you, (since we had both made so frequent and fruitless Attempts towards the Conviction and Conversion of each other, that I despaired of the least Success, and I am persuaded, you did too) that I would only insist once more on the notorious Inconsistency of your Principle and Actions in the Case controverted: So notorious, that I said, you must needs be Self-condemned; an Accusation I would not bring against any Man, if every one could not see it; that can tell Twenty. I said, The Principle of Resistance in some Cases, which you publicly profess, and your Subscription to the *Homilies*, (by which, as one necessary Condition, you hold your Ecclesiastical Preferment, and without doing so, you cannot) which universally, most flagrantly, and most significantly forbid the least Resistance in any Case, are inconsistent and contradictory; and that any one who could hear, or read, and was not a perfect Idiot, must and could understand the *Homilies* in no other sense, than that of an absolute Non-resistance. Now if I can make it appear as plainly, as that Two and Two make Four, that the *Homilies* (the whole and entire currency of them, without the least possible Evasion or Exception) do teach an absolute Non-resistance to our Prince in all Cases, and for any Cause whatever, (and you cannot but know they do) then are You inconsistent with Yourself, and Self-condemned; and if I do not make it plainly appear, that you are so, I will be content to be thought guilty of uncharitable and rash Judgment, and beg

A 3 your

your Pardon : Otherwise you must remember, you gave the just Occasion , and Scandal of the Charge. You will , you must allow , that he , who maintains both Parts of an apparent Contradiction to be true , must necessarily be inconsistent and self-condemned ; if I do not prove that upon you, I will bear the Blame. I have intimated the Profession of your Mouth to be for an Obedience qualified ; the Subscription of your Hand (which you have wrote, *willingly*, and *ex animo*, *vide* Can.36.) to be for Obedience (either active or passive) unconditional. Now these are a notorious Contradiction , of which you cannot possibly be ignorant , for which I charge you as Self-condemned ; my Business is, to prove it. You are pleased to refer me to Mr. *Hoadly's Measures of Submission* , and tell me , that his Arguments endeavouring to reconcile the Homilies of *Obedience*, and *against wilful Rebellion* , with his and your Principle of Resistance, are your own ; and that in answering his, I shall answer yours. I'll save you the Trouble of transcribing and methodizing, and do it. I shall proceed therefore after this manner.

First , I shall lay down your Principle of Resistance.

Secondly, Produce out of the Homilies, some of the most eminent Passages , which can signify nothing else, but an absolute Prohibition of any Sort of Resistance whatever ; (and if you can produce one Line , that allows or favours Resistance in any Case, or any thing like it, I will yield up the Cause,) together with some cursory Reflections and Observations thereon ; and then ,

Thirdly and lastly, Answer Mr. *Hoadly's* moderate Solutions of the Difficulties of reconciling the Homilies and Resistance, and shew both him and you to be inconsistent and self-condemned, from your inconsistent and contradictory Profession of Resistance in some Cases, and the entire Scope, Sence, and Letter of the Homilies against it in all , to which you both have *Willingly* and *ex Animo* Subscribed. And ,

I. I shall

1. I shall lay down your Principle of Resistance:

It is this: That in Cases of extream and apparent Danger and Ruin to the Community, a Rightful Prince may be resisted with Violence by the People, and (if they conceive fit) may be laid aside. Now,

2. Let us see what the Homilies say to this, Those Homilies, which you say you have *willingly* and *ex animo* subscribed, as you do now *willingly* and *ex animo* promulgate the Doctrin of Resistance to our Rightful Princes, in some Cases.

In the Second Part of the Sermon of Obedience, are these remarkable Words: [*Pag. 65. lin. 6.*] "All Subjects
"are bound to obey them, as God's Ministers, yea altho'
"they be evil, not only for Fear, but also for Conscience
"sake. And here (good People) let us mark *diligently*,
"that it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects IN
"ANY CASE, to resist and stand against the Superior
"Powers: (*meaning Tyrannical Kings and Magistrates*) for
"S. Paul's Words be plain, that *whosoever withstandeth*,
"shall get to themselves damnation; for *whosoever with-*
"standeth, *withstandeth the ordinance of God.* To this
you have subscribed, if you have subscribed to any
thing; and yet you say, in some Cases, it is lawful to
resist, or depose the Prince. Are not therefore your Pro-
fession and Subscription plainly inconsistent, and con-
tradictory, as much as at the same time to be, and not
to be? In some Cases, you say, you may resist; and
at the same time by Subscription say, it is not lawful
to resist in any Case. "These Homilies [*by Artic. 35.*]
"are judged to be read *diligently* and *distinctly* by
"you, that they may be understood by the People."
Is it possible for the People, when they hear this read,
to understand it in any other sence, (especially since
the whole current of the Homilies are to the same effect)
than of absolute Non-resistance? "It is not lawful,
"saith the Homily, for Inferiours and Subjects, in any
"Case to resist, and stand against the Superior Powers."
And yet, (if that Position be true) they must under-
stand it in the quite contrary sence, that it is lawful in
some cases. If therefore your Doctrin be true, when you

read this or the other Homily *against Rebellion*, when you come to this, or the like Sentence, (if you would be just to the Souls of your Parishioners, for whose Sins and Errors you will be responsible, if occasioned by your wilful neglect) you ought to tell them, that the Truth of the Doctrine and Meaning of the Homily are diametrically opposite to the Sound and Sence of the Letter : And that wheresoever they find the Words, *You shall in no case resist*, they are to understand, they are to resist in some cases ; otherwise it is no more possible from the Letter, Sence, Coherence, and universal Tendency of the Homilies, to find Resistance in some cases lawful, (when in every place they say, it is unlawful) than it is for any one of your Flock to believe it lawful to commit Adultery, when you preach it to be utterly and *toto genere* unlawful. And here, methinks, it is very pleasant to observe, that your *Dux Gregis*, Mr. Hoadly, and your self too, in your Expositions of the two first Verses of the 13th to the *Romans*, exclude a total Non-resistance, and yet must allow it by Subscription to this Homily, which plainly brings those Words of *S. Paul* to prove the Duty of absolute Non-resistance to evil Princes, saying, “ *S. Paul’s* Words be plain, that who-
 “ soever withstandeth such a Prince, shall get to them-
 “ selves Damnation ; for whosoever withstandeth, with-
 “ standeth the Ordinance of God.” But you and Mr. Hoadly say, that he that withstandeth such a Prince in some cases, shall merit, shall not only be more likely to be in a State of Safety here, but (if he be not otherwise an unrepenting Sinner) he shall be sure of Eternal Salvation hereafter. Is it possible for any Man, reading the Homilies, to believe, that one Man in the World would or could understand them in your Sence ? For my part I do not believe it possible. To have the Homilies literally condemn Resistance in all cases, even without the least shadow of Exception ; and for some with great Assurance, to affirm that they do not do it, is a greater Affront to the common Sense of Mankind, than it can be an act of Uncharitableness for any one to say, such an Assertor is inconsistent and self-

self-condemned. This is literally to put out the Eyes and stop up the Ears of Mankind, or to say, that none can see or hear but your selves. 'Tis true, we are not obliged to consent to every Expression in the Homilies, or to say, the Application of every Text of Scripture is exact; yet are we obliged to the general Scope and Tendency of every Homily; or else I know not why they were framed, or commanded to be read for the Instruction of the People. If you say, we are not thus obliged, I know no other way of instructing the People in the Sense of the Homilies, (which were designed with that brevity and plainness, as to want no Explication) than to declare the Sense of them to be exactly contrary to the Letter. Whether Resistance be lawful or not, is not at present the Dispute between you and me, only whether the Homilies allow it in any case. I say no, you say yes. I can read my Assertion in them in most express Words. Do you prove but one just Inference for your Argument, and it shall be allowed. Whether Mr. *Hoadly's* Exposition of the two first Verses of the 13th to the *Romans*, for Resistance, be right or wrong, it is not my business now to determine; it is enough for me, that the Homily quoted says peremptorily, that *S. Paul* in that place declares absolutely against all manner of Resistance. If the Homily be mistaken in the Sense of the Text, and its Application, it makes no great matter, for the case is not now, whether the Text be here rightly understood and expounded in the Homily, but whether a Man of common Sense can suppose the Homily to understand it in favour of Resistance in any case; or whether a Man in his Wits can believe, that any one can subscribe those Words of *S. Paul*, as encouraging, or but so much as allowing any manner of Resistance, when there is not one Expression in any Homily for Resistance, but all against resisting in any sense, case, or under any temptation. If the Law of Nature (as is pretended) be for Resistance, I am sure the Homilies are not. They may therefore be discarded and reprobated; but whilst they stand amongst the authentick Acts of our Church, absolute Non-resistance will

will be the Doctrine of it, and all Subscribers must own it, or lay themselves under the deserved Imputation of the most apparent *Autocratism* in nature. If you have not subscribed to the Doctrine of absolute Non-resistance in subscribing the Homilies, be pleased to tell me in your Answer, what you have subscribed to, and how it may be collected from the Homilies which you have subscribed.

Mr. Hoadly (and you his *Umbra*) say, when a Prince abuseth his Authority, to the great mischief or ruin of his Subjects, that he loseth his Authority, and may be resisted; and yet you both subscribe the quite contrary in the aforesaid Homily of *Obedience*: Read these Words, beginning at the 12th Line; and you may as well say they are not there, as that the sense of them is not wholly exclusive of Resistance in any case: “ Our Saviour Christ himself, and his Apostles, received many and divers Injuries of the unfaithful and wicked Men in Authority; yet we never read, that they or any of them caused any Sedition or Rebellion against Authority. We read oft, that they patiently suffered all Troubles, Vexations, Slanders, Pangs, and Pains, and Death itself (*oh foolish Martyrs!*) obediently, without Tumult or Resistance. They committed their Cause to him that judgeth righteously, and prayed for their Enemies heartily and earnestly. They knew, that the Authority of the Powers was God’s Ordinance, and therefore both in their Words and Deeds they taught ever Obedience to it, and never taught, nor did, the contrary. The wicked Judge *Pilate* said to Christ, *Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power also to loose thee?* Jesus answered, *Thou could’st have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.* Whereby Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked Rulers have their Power and Authority from God, (*How then do they fall from it for being Wicked and Tyrannical?*) and therefore it is not lawful for their Subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their Power.” Here the Homily plainly distinguishes

distinguisheth between ^{the} Authority of the Higher Powers; and the End for which it is given; both which you confound and make the same. "They knew, saith the Homily, that the Authority of the Powers was God's Ordinance, and therefore both in Words and Deeds they taught ever Obedience to it, and never taught; nor did, the contrary." You say, in flat contradiction to what you subscribe, that they had *no Authority*, whilst they did thus barbarously Persecute, and ought to have been resisted. The Homily says, "Whereby Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked Rulers have their Power and Authority from God, and therefore it is not lawful for their Subjects to withstand them." You say as plainly, Such wicked and tyrannical Rulers have no Power or Authority from God, and therefore ought to be withstood. Are not these gross Inconsistencies and Contradictions, and can you choose but see them? Pray (Sir!) try your Hand to reconcile and qualify them. If your Parishioners should hear you read this Homily, could they take it in any other than a literal Sense; or believe you, if you said You did? And yet you ought to tell them so, when you read this Homily, for otherwise it is impossible for them to know, that you take it so. And thus it becomes you to act with them in all Faithfulness; for either absolute Non-resistance is a damnable Doctrine, or Resistance in any case is; and it is as necessary for them to know, which of these is the damnable Sin, as to know the Sinfulness of any other Vice whatever.

[P. 66; 67.] The Homily produces the case of *David's* having had twice an opportunity of destroying *Saul*, his mortal Enemy, and of his refusing to do it, purely out of the Sense he had of the plain Duty of Non-resistance; and of his slaying the *Amalekite*, for killing *Saul* in the most favourable case; as an unanswerable Argument, that neither one, nor all the Subjects of a tyrannical Prince, ought to resist with violence their Sovereign Lord. I have heard you yourself say, You would resist him with violence, on a personal Invasion of your Life; and you may as well do it on the Invasion
of

of your Property ; (and no question but you may do it singly, as well as in conjunction with a great number; for the case of one is the case of all) but I think the Homily puts the Objection, and makes the Answer in direct opposition to you. Read them both in these Words: “ But peradventure some here would say, “ That *David* in his own defence might have killed “ King *Saul* lawfully, and with a safe conscience. But “ holy *David* did know, that he might in nowise withstand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign Lord and King: “ He did know, that he was but King *Saul*’s Subject, “ tho’ he were in great Favour with God, and his Enemy King *Saul* out of God’s Favour. Therefore tho’ “ he were *never so much provoked*, yet he refused utterly “ to hurt the Lord’s Anointed. He durst not for offending God, and his own Conscience, (although he “ had occasion and opportunity) once lay his Hands “ upon God’s high Officer the King, whom he did “ know to be a Person reserved, and kept, (for his “ Office sake) *only to God’s Punishment and Judgment*; “ therefore he prayeth so oft and earnestly, that he lay “ not his Hands upon the Lord’s Anointed.” Now here the Homily says, in as plain Words as Men can write in, (if they are not so, pray do you make them plainer) “ That a Subject may in no wise, with a safe “ Conscience, withstand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign “ Lord and King, tho’ never so Persecuting and Tyrannical: Tho’ he were *never so much provoked*, ought “ not he to do it, (*which, I hope, excludeth all cases, for “ nothing can exceed the utmost Provocation*) knowing “ such a Person to be reserved, and kept (for his Office “ sake) *only to God’s Punishment and Judgment* ;” and therefore not to the Judgment and Punishment of one, or all the People. But perhaps you will not stick to say, when he becomes a Tyrant, he ceaseth to be a King, (*I have known you stoop so low at a dead list*) and therefore in resisting and murdering such an one, according to your pretended Law of Self-preservation you do not resist your King, but a lawless Tyrant. I reply, you cannot but have heard of that true and universally received distinction

on of *Tyrannus sine titulo*, and *Tyrannus exercitio* ; the last of which is the supposed case in the Homilies, in contradistinction to the former ; for at the same time they prohibit Resistance to such an one, they declare him to be the lawful King and Prince ; and for that cause not to be resisted on any Provocation. Now suppose there was truth in your Objection, yet is it manifest, that by your Subscription you have as clearly opposed it, as the stoutest Passive Obedience-Man alive, unless a Man is arrived at that perfection, as to deny his own hand. It is very remarkable, “ That *David* is said to pray oft
 “ and earnestly that God would not suffer him to lay
 “ his Hands upon the Lord’s Anointed, King *Saul*.⁵¹”
 He was afraid lest he should be tempted by such *Glorious Opportunities* to transgress his Duty, and therefore begged God’s Assistance and preventing Grace. But had you been in his case, (notwithstanding all the Subscriptions and Obligations to the contrary, from Laws Divine and Human) you would have embraced the first, thanked God for the occasion, and immortalized the Act with the title of *Providence*, and a *Glorious Deliverance*. And that even such a wicked and tyrannical Prince, is yet an instrument and cause too of much Good to the People in a great many cases, (and violent Resistance in none) and so answers *S. Paul’s* Character, that he is the Minister of God for good ; (whatever *Mr. Hoadly* and you may profess) is evidently shewn to be the Sence of the Compilers and Authorisers of this Homily, from these following Words. [P. 69. l. 1.]
 “ And by these two Examples (of *David’s* Non-resistance of *Saul* in the Camp and in the Cave) Holy
 “ *David* (being named in Scripture a Man after God’s
 “ own Heart) giveth a general Rule and Lesson to all
 “ Subjects in the World, not to withstand their Liege
 “ Lord and King, not to take a Sword by their private
 “ Authority against the King, God’s Anointed, who
 “ only (and therefore no other) beareth the Sword by
 “ God’s Authority, for the Maintenance of the Good,
 “ and for the Punishment of the Evil, (which yet *Saul*
 “ was far from doing in relation to innocent *David*,
 “ and

“ and several other of his good Subjects, for he was a
 “ Persecutor) who only (*and therefore no other against
 him*) “ by God’s Law hath the use of the Sword at his
 “ command, and also hath all Power, Jurisdiction,
 “ Regiment, Correction, and Punishment, as Supreme
 “ Governor of all his Realms and Dominions, and
 “ that even by the Authority of God, and by God’s Or-
 “ dinance.” It is plain by the Persecution of *David*,
 that *Saul* could not be said to maintain the Good in
 that particular, (nor in the case of Hundreds of others,
 of which I will make mention, when I come to answer
 Mr. *Hoadly*’s Argument, that *David*’s was a private
 and personal Case) for he persecuted most unjustly his
 faithful Subject: So that the Sense of such a Prince’s
 being said to bear the Sword by God’s Authority for the
 Maintenance of the Good, is expressive both of what a
 Prince ought to do, and what the worst of Princes in
 some measure do, vastly beyond the Benefits (upon a
 due Calculation, and ballancing Accounts from History)
 of forcible Resistance on the most plausible Pretext.
 “ These Examples (continues the Homily l. 25.) being
 “ so manifest and evident, (*meaning of Passive Obe-*
dience under Tyrants) “ it is an intolerable Ignorance,
 “ Madness, and Wickedness, for Subjects to make any
 “ Murmuring, Rebellion, Resistance, or Withstanding,
 “ Commotion, or Insurrection against their most dear
 “ and dread Sovereign Lord and King, ordained and
 “ appointed of God’s Goodness for their Commodity,
 “ Peace and Quietness.” And all this tho’ such Tyrants
 should not tolerably answer the Ends of the Authority
 conferred on them by God. If this be true, (as a Man
 of tolerable Reach must believe, that Mr. *Hoadly* and
 you thought so by your voluntary Subscriptions, and he
 must put great Force upon himself to believe otherwise,
 or else what Faith is to be reposed in Words and Sub-
 scriptions?) *what intolerable Ignorance, Madness, and*
Wickedness must you be guilty of in maintaining, that your
lawful Prince may be resisted and coerced; and in maintain-
ing all this too, from the concurrent Sense of the Homilies?
 And here Mr. *Hoadly* hath consented to a strong Answer

to a very weak Question he hath more than once started, in relation to the Duty of Absolute Obedience, implying, that if Obedience to our Prince be absolute, then we ought to do whatever he commands us, whether the thing be lawful or unlawful; whereas this very Homily in Scripture-Words, to which he hath subscribed, (*after having enjoined Absolute Obedience to the worst Princes*) casteth our Duty of Absolute Obedience into Passive as well as Active, saying, " Yet let us believe undoubtedly (good Christian People) that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other, (though they be our own Fathers) if they would command us to do any thing contrary to God's Commandments. In such a case we ought to say, with the Apostle, *We must rather obey God than Man*. But nevertheless in that case, we may not in anywise withstand violently, or rebell against Rulers, or make any Insurrection, Sedition, or Tumults, either by force of Arms, (or otherwise) against the Anointed of the Lord, or any of his Officers; but we must in such case, patiently suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, (*therefore not revenge the greatest; this used to be the way of reasoning in former times*) " referring the Judgment of our Cause only to God; and therefore not to the Arbitration of the People. Such an Objection to an Absolute Obedience is much below the Sense of Mr. Hoadly, when he writes on defensible Subjects.

In the third and last part of this Sermon of Obedience, l. 7. is recapitulated in few Words the Sense of the foregoing, *That for no cause we may resist the Magistrate, tho' he be wicked*; as it is said in the second part, *That we may in no case resist*; Words entirely of the same Sense, and almost of the same Letters. I would not for the World, it had been said, *We may not resist upon any Pretence whatever*; for then some of our Divines, according to their modern Divinity and Casuistry, would have nimbly replied, It is true, we may not resist upon any Pretence, but we may in a real Case, or for a real Cause; as if the Word there, *Pretence*, was not totally exclusive; tho' Persons of less Sagacity and Penetration, would

would have thought the Statute in the first Year of King Charles the Second's Recovery of his Crown, forbidding Resistance *on any Pretence* whatever, to have signified *for no Cause, or in no Case* conceivable, especially when some other Acts about the same time told the World, That *the Power of the Sword was, and is always solely in the King*, (and then not by any original Authority in the People) and that *neither Lords, nor Commons, collectively nor representatively, had any coercive Power over him.* [vide 12 and 13 of Charles the Second] And I must tell you, Sir! had the Homilies said no more than barely, *We may not resist our lawful Prince*, and had they not been confirmed by Parliament, but Convocation only, you must be supposed to have subscribed them in the Sence of Absolute Non-resistance, and in no other: For the whole Statute-Law is so clearly for Absolute Non-resistance, that I will give up the Cause, if you can produce one, that but seems to favour Resistance before these late Disputes began. And for this reason therefore, if for no other, your Homilies must be supposed to mean Absolute Non-resistance, since the Statutes most evidently do so; for the 36th Canon which enjoins you to subscribe the 39 Articles, and in pursuance of it, the Books of Homilies, is founded originally on the Authority of the 25th of Henry the Eighth, which nulls any Canon or Ecclesiastical Law made in contradiction to any precedent Law of the Land. So, that since the Laws allow of the Subscription, authorised by an immediate Authority only of King and Convocation, they can be supposed only to allow the Homilies (were there but these six Words in them, *Thou shalt not resist thy Prince*) in that Sence, in which the Statutes against Resistance must be taken; otherwise the Law would allow a Subscription contrary to Law.

Lin. 16, 17. The King is called *God's High Principal Judge on Earth*; therefore the People are his Inferiours, and cannot judge him. This is the common way of Argumentation, and the Sence of your Subscription, if it can mean any thing. **P. 69. l. 24.** The Homily conceives the Sence of *S. Peter* to be, *1 Pet. 2.* That *Kings*

are

are chief Heads and Rulers; and says, *The Words are so plain, that they need no Exposition*; but they have need of Exposition, (and of an uncommon Head and Face too, to do it) if they must mean the quite contrary, that they are neither *chief Heads*, nor *Rulers*; for such they are not, if the People can lawfully resist or depose them: for he who hath Power over another, in as much, and as far as he hath that Power, is the other's Head and Ruler. [*Lin. 34.*] the Sermon saith, This is God's " Ordinance, God's Commandment, and God's holy " Will, y^e the whole Body of every Realm, and all the " Members and Parts of the same shall be subject to " their Head, the King; and that (as *St. Peter* writeth) " for the Lord's sake; and (as *St. Paul* writeth) for " Conscience sake, and not for Fear only." How is this reconcilable with your's, and your Friend *Hoadly's* giving Power to the great People of the Land, to resist in some Cases their Lawful Prince; when by the full scope of the precedent parts of this Homily, this same King is declar'd to be irresistible in *any Case*, or for *any Cause* whatever? If you can reconcile this, you have a strange Faculty of making Peace between the most opposite Things in Nature, apparent and flaming Contradictions. At this Healing Rate, Sir! I defy you to Preach the most plain, practical Sermon, by which your Parishioners can be edified; nay, know what you mean: It will be impossible for them to understand you, unless they take along with them this infallible Rule, That they must be sure to understand you always in a Sence directly opposite to the Sound and Letter of your Doctrin.

I come now to the Homily against *Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*. By the by, give me leave to observe, That your Patròn Mr. *Hoadly*, in his *Measures of Submission*, hath, (I will not say, designedly) passed over the Notice of this *Exhortation, concerning good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*; as if he had never Subscribed to it, nor had been obliged to reconcile it with his present publick Military Declarations.

[*Part I. pag. 354. lin. 3.*] The Homily argues *a fortiori*, “ That if Servants ought to obey their Masters, “ not only being gentle, but such as be froward ; as “ well and MUCH MORE ought Subjects to be “ obedient , not only to their good and courteous , but “ also to their sharp and rigorous Princes ; *therefore not to resist them with Violence.* [*Lin. 5.*] The Homily declares, that God not only constituteth Princes to prevent Confusions, and for the Benefit and Quiet of Subjects, but also, that they may resemble him in Power and Authority too ; saying , “ So hath he constituted, “ ordained , and set Earthly Princes over particular “ Kingdoms and Dominions in Earth , both for the “ avoiding of all Confusion, which else would be in the “ World , if it should be without Governors ; and for “ the great Quiet and Benefit of Earthly Men their Subjects ; and also , that the Princes themselves in “ *Authority, Power, Wisdom, Providence, and Righteousness,* in Government of People and Countries “ committed to their Charge, should resemble his Heavenly Governance ; as the Majesty of Heavenly Things “ may by the Baseness of Earthly Things be shadowed “ and resembled. Now if they were not irresistible, they could not be like him in *Power* and *Authority*. Perhaps you will say, But our King hath not Power and Authority to make Laws without the Concurrence of the Parliament, and therefore his Power cannot resemble the Power of God, who can make what Laws he pleases. I reply, As God can and doth often oblige himself to Laws of his own Concession , so may Concessions be made by Earthly Potentates : And as God is Almighty, notwithstanding such Concessions, whereby he has obliged himself to his Creatures ; so is the King irresistible, by the Letter and Sense of all his Laws ; notwithstanding such Legal and Statute-Concessions, to which he stands in strict Conscience bound.

[*Pag. 355. lin. 7.*] “ The Scriptures declare, *saieth the Homily*, that when the Wicked do reign, then Men “ go to ruin ; and again , A foolish Prince destroyeth the People, and a covetous King undoeth his Subjects :
and

and yet this same Homily saith, that such a King or Prince is not to be withstood with Violence. Read the following Answer. "What shall Subjects do then? Shall they obey valiant, stout, wise, and good Princes; and contemn, disobey, and rebel against Children being their Princes, or against indiscreet and evil Governors? God forbid! For first, What a perilous thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the Judgment, which Prince is wise and godly, and his Government good, and which is otherwise? as though the Foot must judge of the Head: An Enterprize very heinous, and must needs breed Rebellion:" And yet you and Mr. *Hoadly* openly maintain the contrary to what you have subscribed in this Homily; you teach, that such Princes may be withstood with Violence, and deposed. Your Principles are, That when a King goeth about to *ruin, destroy, and undo his People*, he may be resisted and deposed; (nay, that he ought to be so served) but the Homily says, in as plain Words as possible, that tho' he should go about to *ruin, destroy, and undo his People*, yet he is still not to be resisted. Whatever Objection the Wit of Man may make to the Doctrin of Irresistibility, it cannot possibly object to the Sence of the Homily in that Point. To endeavour to do it, is to impose on the Common Sense of Mankind. And in my Conscience, I do not believe from the Beginning of the World to this Day, and from this Day to the End of it, that ever any Hereditary Prince, who had Heirs, ever did, or will design the total Ruin or Destruction of his Subjects, (for that would be to destroy Himself, and his Posterity after him) but only through excessive Weakness, or prevalence of evil (but unsuspected) Counsel, he might possibly be extreemly injurious to them, and, by consequence, much more to his own true and proper Interest. [*Lin. 19, &c.*] "Rebellion is called the greatest of all Mischiefs, and Rebels the worst of all Subjects; meaning, (as it appears by the context) Resistance to Princes on any Account, tho' they were the worst of Men: And yet you and Mr. *Hoadly* proclaim

it, *The Glorious Cause of GOD*. Here wants another Healing stroke. Let Resistance in some Cases be the Cause of GOD as much as it will, when you can reconcile it with the Homilies, or reconcile Yourself with Yourself, in this case you shall be the Great *Apollo* of the Age. Suppose you should Preach the Homilies to them, who never read, or heard of them before, Is it possible for them to receive them in a qualified sence of Resistance somewhere, and sometimes? I have heard of a scandalous Reflexion cast on a Preacher, that he should bid his People follow what he said, not what he did: but I never before heard one intimate, that the People should not believe one Word he told them from the Pulpit or Desk, as you do; when out of the Church you declare for Resistance of the Prince in some Cases; and in the Church, in reading the Homilies you declare it unlawful in any Case. And that you once thought the Homilies, and some Practices, utterly inconsistent, I have great reason to believe, from an Expression I have heretofore heard from you.

[*Pag.eadem, lin.36.*] “A Rebel is worse than the worst Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst Government of the worst Princethat *hitherto* hath been.” Can you Subscribe an Homily in which are these Words, and yet plead for Resistance in *any Case*? Is a Rebel, *i.e.* (as is the Sence of both Homilies, of that of *Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*, and of this, *against Wilful Rebellion*) a Person resisting his Lawful Prince with Violence, worse than the worst Prince; and Rebellion, *i.e.* (according to these Homilies any manner of violent Resistance of our Lawful Prince) worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince that *hitherto* hath been: And yet is a Rebel and Rebellion better too, at the same time? Can the same thing be better and worse at the same Instant? And yet it must be so, if he, who resisteth such a Prince, is better than the worst Prince, as you profess them; yet much worse than the worst Prince, as your Subscription testifies. What Distance and Difference are there between Tongue and Hand! It will not be enough to say, (as your Friend Mr.*Hoadly* doth imply) that

that the following words call that only Rebellion, which is raised for small Matters. The precedent words cut off all manner of Relief for Resistance of any Sort, and in any Case. Besides, tho' the Homily says, " Rebels are unmeet Ministers, and Rebellion an unfit and unwholsom Medicin to reform any small Lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little Grievs in Government: " Yet it says also in the very next words, " Such lewd Remedies (*you call them godly ones*) are far worse than any other Maladies and Disorders (*without any Exception, of what Kind or Degree they be*) that can be in the Body of the Commonwealth.

[*Pag. 356. lin. 6.*] But what if the Prince be indiscreet, and evil indeed, and is also evident to all Men's Eyes that he is so? Here the most Tyrannical Prince is supposed, and that his Tyranny is so notorious, that every body must needs see it. What is to be done in such a Case? This is your supposed Case of National and Notorious Tyranny; and yet even here, no other Arms or Remedies are allowed, but the old rusty *Preces & Lachryma*, and Amendment of our naughty Lives, most commonly (if not always) the Judicial Cause of National Calamities. " I ask again, (saith the Homily) What if it be long of the Wickedness of the Subjects, that the Prince is indiscreet and evil? Shall the Subjects both by their Wickedness provoke God, for their deserved Punishment, to give them an evil or indiscreet Prince; and also rebel against him, and withall against God, who, for the Punishment of their Sins, did give them such a Prince? God (say the holy Scriptures) maketh (*not only permiteth*) a wicked Man to reign for the Sins of the People." And that the Homily meaneth this Text not in the sence of Permission only, but of Approbation too, of the Prince, not of the Wickedness of him; *quatenus Rex, non quatenus Tyrannus*; read it thus, beginning at *Lin. 28.* " If we will have an evil Prince (when God shall send such an one) taken away, and a good one in his Place, let us take away our Wickedness, which provoketh God to place such an one

“ over us, and God will either displace him, (*though Men ordinarily have not Faith enough to trust God in such a Case*) or of an evil Prince make him a good one; so
 “ that we first will change our Evil into Good. For
 “ will you hear the Scriptures? The Heart of the Prince
 “ is in God’s Hand, (*some People think, they are safer, when the King’s Heart is in their own Hand*) which way
 “ soever it shall please him, he turneth it. Thus say the
 “ Scriptures: Wherefore let us turn from our Sins unto
 “ the Lord with all our Hearts, and he will turn the
 “ Heart of the Prince unto our Quiet and Wealth: Else
 “ for Subjects to deserve through their Sins to have an
 “ evil Prince, and then to rebel against him, were
 “ double and treble Evil, by provoking God more to
 “ plague them. Nay, let us either deserve to have a
 “ good Prince, or let us patiently suffer, and obey such
 “ as we deserve. And whether the Prince be good
 “ or evil, let us, according to the Counsel of the holy
 “ Scriptures, pray for the Prince, for his continuance
 “ and increase in Goodness, if he be good; and for his
 “ amendment, if he be evil. ” Tho’ therefore a Ty-
 rannical Prince be a Judgment of God on a Nation, as
 is a Plague or Pestilence, yet are we not to endeavour
 to remove him ourselves, as we would an Epidemical
 Distemper; (as is the Sence sometimes, and Expression
 of some of your Brethren) at least the Sence of the Ho-
 mily is full to the contrary, and that is enough for my
 Purpose. And, [*Pag. 357.*] the *Sermon* tells you, that
 such a Monster and Tyrant reigned about the time of
 St. Paul’s writing this Epistle; saying, [*Line 1.*]
 “ And I pray you, who was Prince over the most part of
 “ the Christians, when God’s Holy Spirit by St. Paul’s
 “ Pen gave them this Lesson? Forsooth! *Caligula*,
 “ *Claudius*, or *Nero*; who were not only no Christians,
 “ but Pagans, and also either foolish Rulers, or most cruel
 “ Tyrants: ” Meaning, that S. Paul designed absolute
 Non-resistance to the worst of Tyrants: For supposing
 St. Paul had wrote this Epistle, or the other to the
Romans, within the *quinquennium* of *Nero*, (as Mr. Hoadly
 hopes, the kind World will take upon trust on his Conje-
 cture,

ſure, without Proof) it is plain, the Publick Voice, both
 of Church and State in the Homily, ſuppoſeth it a Duty
 under the worſt of Princes, by naming the Perſons of
 the Emperours, *Caligula*, *Claudius*, or *Nero*. And the
 following Inſtance of the *Jews* being commanded abſo-
 lute Non-reſiſtance (not becauſe they could not reſiſt,
 but becauſe they ought not, tho' they had had Power,
 for the Command is without Reſtriction or Limitation)
 to *Nebuchadonoſor* King of *Babylon*, under the ſevereſt
 Acts of Tyranny and Perſecution, is, *ad corroborandum*,
 and is a ſuperabundant Addition to the Strength of my
 Poſition; That Abſolute Non-reſiſtance is an indiſ-
 penſable Duty, and that it is the univerſal and un-
 avoidable Sence of the Homilies. Begin at [*Lin. 5.*]
 " Will you yet hear the Word of God to the *Jews*,
 " when they were Priſoners under *Nebuchadonoſor* King
 " of *Babylon*, after he had ſlain their King, Nobles,
 " Parents, Children and Kinsfolks, burned their Coun-
 " try, Cities, yea *Jeruſalem* itſelf, and the holy Tem-
 " ple, and had carried the reſidue remaining alive,
 " captive with him to *Babylon*? Will you hear yet,
 " what the Prophet *Baruch* ſaith unto God's People being
 " in this Captivity? Pray you, ſaith the Prophet,
 " for the Life of *Nebuchadonoſor* King of *Babylon*, (*Knock*
him on the Head, ſay you, ſuch a Rebel againſt his Subjects!)
 " and for the Life of *Balthaſar* his Son; that their Days
 " may be as the Days of Heaven upon the Earth; that
 " God alſo may give us Strength and lighten our Eyes,
 " that we may live under the Defence of *Nebuchadonoſor*
 " King of *Babylon*, (*It ſeems then, a Nation might make*
a ſhift, eſpecially if it were not rebellious and reſiſting, to
live under ſuch a Prince, tho' not ſo comfortably, as under
a gracious one;) " and under the Protection of *Baltha-*
 " ſar his Son; that we may long do them Service,
 (*What! ſuch Tyrants, as were not fit to live?*) " and
 " find Favour in their ſight. Pray for us alſo unto
 " the Lord our God, for we have ſinned againſt the
 " Lord our God. Thus far the Prophet *Baruch* his
 " Words, which were ſpoken by him (continues the
 " Homily) unto the People of God, of that King, who

" was an Heathen, a Tyrant, and cruel Oppressor of
 " them, and had been a murderer of many *Thousands*
 " of their Nation, (*will you, Sir ! suffer your Prince to*
proceed half so far, before you resist him? and I dare engage,
if he was a notorious Tyrant, he shall not desire more;)
 " and a destroyer of their Country, with a Confession
 " that their Sins had deserved such a Prince to reign
 " over them. And shall the old Christians, (say the
 " Compilers of this Homily) by *S. Paul's* Exhortation
 " pray for *Caligula, Claudius, or Nero*? Shall the *Jews*
 " pray for *Nebuchadonosor*? These Emperors and Kings
 " being Strangers unto them, being Pagans and Infidels,
 " being Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppressors
 " of them, and Destroyers of their Country-men and
 " Kinsmen, the Burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities,
 " and Temples: And shall not we pray for the long,
 " prosperous, and godly Reign of our Natural Prince?
 " no Stranger, &c." If absolute Non-resistance was
 due to such Princes, (as the Homily most plainly saith
 it was) I desire you to give the Character of one that
 may be resisted without bidding Defiance to the Homily.
 Find him out, and then I will tell you more of my
 mind. Again, p. 358. l. 13. speaking in commendation
 of the Prince then reigning, (saith the Homily)
 " What shall we say of these Men, who use themselves
 " thus Rebellionously against their Gracious Sovereign?
 " who, if God for their *Wickedness* had given them an
 " *Heathen Tyrant* to reign over them, were by *God's*
 " Word bound to obey him, and to pray for him."
Your Interpretation of this in your next.

[Part. II. p. 361.] The Homily (after having plentifully
 set down the famous Cases of *Saul* and *David* against
 Resistance of any sort or size) asketh and resolveth these
 remarkable Questions; saying, " Let *David*
 " answer to such Demands, as Men desirous of Rebel-
 " lion do use to make: Shall not we, specially being
 " so good Men as we are, rise and rebel against a
 " Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy; and there-
 " fore likely not to prosper either in War or Peace, but
 " to be hurtful and pernicious to the Commonwealth?

" No

“ No, faith good and godly *David*, God’s and *such a*
 “ *King’s* faithful Subject : And so convicting such Sub-
 “ jects as attempt any Rebellion against *such a King*,
 “ to be neither good Subjects nor good Men.” So faith
 consistent and honest *Timothy* by manual Subscription ;
 but by oral Profession quite otherwise declareth *Philau-*
mus : “ But, say they, shall we not rise and rebell against
 “ so unkind a Prince, nothing considering or regarding
 “ our true, faithful, and painful Service, or the safe-
 “ guard of our Posterity ? No, faith good *David*, whom
 “ no such unkindness could cause to forsake his due
 “ Obedience to his Sovereign.” To this your outward
 Man assents by voluntary Subscription, but your in-
 ward Man declares the contrary from the great Law of
 Self-preservation. There is nothing like sleeping in a
 whole Skin. “ Shall we not, say they, rise and rebell
 “ against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy, that
 “ seeketh our Lives ? No, faith godly *David*, who had
 “ learned the Lesson that our Saviour afterwards plain-
 “ ly taught, That we should do no hurt to our Fellow-
 “ Subjects, though they hate us and be our Enemies :
 “ Much less unto our Prince, though he were our Enemy.”
 I beg *David’s* and my Prince’s Pardon for that, (quoth
Philamus) for though I subscribe with one hand, I’ll
 run him through with the other, or perhaps with the
 same, if he violently invade the superiour Authority of
 the Kingdom of *Me*. “ Shall we not assemble an Ar-
 “ my of such good Fellows as we are, and by hazard-
 “ ing of our Lives, and the Lives of such as withstand
 “ us, and withal hazarding the whole Estate of our
 “ Country, remove so naughty a Prince ? No, faith
 “ godly *David*, for I, when I might without assembling
 “ Force, or number of Men, without Tumult or hazard
 “ of any Man’s Life, or shedding of any drop of Blood,
 “ have deliver’d my Self and my Country (*my Country*,
says David ; so that his Case then was not personal only, as
Mr. Hoadly would weakly persuade the World, as I will
 shew you afterwards : however it is plain, the Homily cannot
 be supposed to think so) “ of an evil Prince, yet would I
 “ not do it.” The more fool *David*, (replies *Philamus*)
 that

that could have deliver'd his Country so easily, with one single Blow; whereas other Subjects, that labour sometimes under great Tyranny, cannot remove the Instrument without vast Destruction and Blood-shed; and most times not so neither. What I have subscribed, I have subscribed; but for all that *David* shall be no Example or Casuist for me. "Are not they, say some, lusty and couragious Captains, valiant Men of Stomach, and good Mens Bodies, that do venture by Force to kill, and depose their King. being a naughty Prince, and their mortal Enemy? (*What think you of this?*) They may be as lusty and couragious as they list, yet faith godly *David*, they can be no good, nor godly Men that do so: For I not only have rebuked, but also commanded him to be slain, as a wicked Man, which slew King *Saul*, mine Enemy, tho' he being weary of his Life for the loss of the Victory against his Enemies, desired that Man to slay him." This is all wrong on my conscience (quoth *Philantus*) I would have made the bold *Amalekite* at least a Secretary of State. Is this the Reward of good and vertuous Actions, to dye for killing the Publick Enemy of my Country? This is small Encouragement to do bravely. "What shall we then do to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us, hateful of God, hurtful to the Commonwealth, &c.? Lay no violent Hand upon him, faith good *David*, but let him live until God appoint and work his End, either by natural Death, or in War by lawful Enemies, not by traitorous Subjects." That is no Policy for me, (quoth *Philantus*) for so he may live to hang me first, and then how shall I be able to answer it to the prime and fundamental Law of Nature, sweet, sweet Self-preservation? No, I'll never be guilty of so great a Sin, when I can prevent it. Is not this your present Profession; and the other, the incontestable Sence of the Homilies? Now what Faith can be reposed in such a Subscription, and such a Profession? The Wit of Man can never reconcile them, nor persuade the World, You are not self-condemned. He, that can believe you are not, seems

seems to me more self-condemned, if possible. I have heard you say the same of those, who professed the Doctrines of Absolute Non-resistance, and did not in all points act accordingly ; and frequently called them Damned Rogues. Are they more inconsistent and self-condemned than your self? No Man will believe so, and you cannot your self. If your Principles and those of your Party be inconsistent with Passive Obedience, I am sure (and all Mankind may know it) that the Homilies are as inconsistent with Resistance in any case. My business is not about the Truth either of absolute Non-resistance, or qualified, but about the irreconcilable Inconsistency of the Homilies with Resistance in any case. If the Homilies are consistent with the Doctrine of Resistance, why do those of the Laity, who are for the Doctrine of Resistance, so openly wish and declare their Desire to have them legally dismissed ; and the Clergy, who write for Resistance, generally pretermitt them ; or if they are forced to touch on them, when they are attacked on that Quarter, they do it with great Humility and Moderation ; whereas in pursuing other Arguments on that Subject, they wax more Confident, and shew greater Spirit and Courage? In this Contest of late, Mr. *Hoadly* is almost an Original on that point : And I see not how any indifferent Person can concur with him in it. Suppose a Foreigner should be inquisitive (as we our selves often are concerning transmarine Churches) about the authentick Doctrines of the Church of *England*, and should read these Homilies, is it possible for him to conceive, they did allow of Resistance in any case? If a Native should yet tell him, that they are plainly reconcilable with Resistance in some cases, would he not expect from him a full Proof from those Sermons, or not believe him, or think that he believed himself? Nay, should good part of the Clergy positively tell him, that notwithstanding the express Letter to the contrary, there was a latent *Distinction*, which would be found out, when Men thought they needed it; would he ever look into the Records of the Church of *England* again, or believe that there was

Faith

Faith in Man, or that any Word or Writing could ever be read or understood? Do but shew by what Evasion, these Homilies can be made to patronize Resistance of the Higher Powers in whatever case, and I will engage to reconcile *verbatim* the Homilies of Fasting, and against Gluttony and Drunkeness, with the Vices therein condemned, and prove them to mean really and literally to recommend them, instead of condemning them.

[Part. IV. p. 372. l. penult.] Are these Words well deserving your most serious Consideration. " Though
 " not only great multitudes of the rude and rascal
 " Commons, but sometime also Men of great Wit,
 " Nobility and Authority, have moved Rebellions
 " against their lawful Princes, (whereas true Nobility
 " should most abhor such villanous, and true Wisdom
 " should most detest such frantick Rebellion) though
 " they should pretend sundry Causes; as the Redress
 " of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of all other
 " Mischiefs doth most destroy) or Reformation of Religion,
 " (whereas Rebellion is most against all true
 " Religion) though they have made a great shew of
 " holy Meaning, by beginning of their Rebellions with
 " a counterfeit Service of God, (as did wicked Absalom begin
 " his Rebellion with Sacrificing unto God) though
 " they display and bear about Ensigns and Banners,
 " which are acceptable unto the rude, ignorant, common
 " People, great multitudes of whom by such false
 " Pretences and Shews they do deceive, and draw unto
 " them: Yet were the multitudes of the Rebels never
 " so huge and great, the Captains never so noble,
 " politick and witty, the Pretences feigned to be never
 " so good and holy, yet the speedy overthrow of all
 " Rebels, of what Number, State, or Condition soever
 " they were, or what Colour or Cause soever they pretended,
 " is, and ever hath been such, that God thereby doth shew,
 " that he alloweth neither the dignity of
 " any Person, nor the multitude of any People, nor the
 " weight of any Cause, as sufficient for the which the
 " Subjects may move Rebellion against their Princes."

Can

Can any Man plead for Resistance after he hath subscribed these Words, or urge, that they are reconcilable with Resistance in some cases? Do these Words (as you are used sometimes to say) only forbid Resistance to one or few Persons, on the account of private and personal Injuries, but never to the Body of a Nation in the greatest and weightiest Causes? Be pleased to shew me one Line in any of your most famous Resistance-Authors more plain for Resistance in some cases, than these Lines are here totally exclusive of Resistance in all. Can a Man forbear saying, a Person that subscribes such Discourses, which contain so many and so significant Expressions for Absolute Non-resistance, (and subscribes them too, as *containing godly, wholsom, and necessary Doctrines, and agreeable to the Word of God*) and yet pleads for Resistance from them, is certainly self-condemned? It would be uncharitable to suppose him otherwise: If it would not be a visible Affront, yet would it be a mental Injury. The thin and insignificant Fig-leaf of no Man being supposed to subscribe to the Truth of every Line in the Homilies, will not afford the least Covering to hide the Nakedness. If the Homilies do not universally (not in one obscure Corner or Line, but almost in every one) plead for Absolute Non-resistance, there is no Sence in them; and no Man can understand them; (they may as well be supposed to contain a devout Dialogue between the *Pope* and the *Grand Seignior*, or what you please) and they were wrote to no End or Purpose. There are some Lines indeed, even in the Words before quoted, that may not hold true in all cases, so as never to fail in one Instance, particularly these; “ Yet were the multitudes of the
 “ Rebels never so huge and great, the Captains never
 “ so noble, politick or witty; the Pretences feigned to
 “ be never so good and holy, yet *the speedy overthrow of*
 “ *all Rebels, &c.*” (for there have been some prosperous Rebellions, which continued for a great while) yet that doth not hinder me from subscribing (and that most willingly, and *ex animo* too) to the Homilies, as containing a godly and wholsom Doctrine, *necessary for*
these

these Times; what is here affirmed being ordinarily true, and seldom failing. Where there are no Positions maintained, establishing or countenancing erroneous and dangerous Doctrines, destructive to our eternal Salvation, either as to Faith or Practice, I can easily subscribe to a Book as wholsom and useful, (and my Subscription would not be condemned by the sober World) tho' it had some Errors of less moment in it, as to some Mistakes of Misapplication, Chronology, or the like. I believe, scarce a judicious Licenser can be found, who would vouch for the Niceness, and Exactness of every Line in the Book, to which he gives his *Imprimatur*; yet the Author may be of great Reputation for the nobleness of his Subject, the weight of his Argument, and the method of his Discourse. **Your** Patriarch *Julian Johnson* said, *The Homilies were the Books best written, next to the Holy Bible, yet are they not without their lesser Imperfections, tho' the Sum, Substance, and Tenour of them contain a most godly and wholsom Doctrine.* I come now in the

Third and last place to answer Mr. *Hoadly's* moderate Solutions of the Difficulties of reconciling the Homilies and Resistance, and shew both him (*and you more fully*) to be inconsistent and self-condemned, from the inconsistent and contradictory Profession of Resistance in some cases, and the entire Scope, Sence, and Letter of the Homilies, against it in all, to which you both have *willingly* and *ex animo* subscribed; yet would *willingly* and *ex animo* get loose from it. But considering how largely I have already proved the Impossibility of a reconciliation of the Homilies with both his and **your** Notion of Resistance, I might easily be excused from that Task; but will not, to prevent even the smallest Exception: For he, who will not excuse the Homilies from asserting Resistance in some cases, (tho' they speak as plainly against it, as Letters and Sounds can speak to the Eye and Ear) will never excuse the Defender of them on that head, if he fail (tho' there happen afterwards to be no occasion for it) in the least jot, or tittle of his Promise. To the Point then:

Measures

Measures of Submission, p. 158. I. i. saith Mr. *Hoadly*;
 " It is manifest, this Subscription was never understood
 " by any in the Church, to signify, that the Person;
 " who subscribes, is obliged to believe every individual
 " Sentence in all the Homilies, and the Interpretation
 " and Application of every particular Text of Scripture
 " quoted in them, to be true, just, and reasonable.
 [See the Answer to this in the last Page; we are both agreed
 in that point.] " The only thing therefore (continues
 " he, p. *eadem* & 159.) that ever was supposed, either
 " by Governors, or Governed in this Church, to be in-
 " tended by this Subscription, was this, That the Per-
 " son subscribing doth truly believe, that the Tenour of
 " the Doctrine contained in the Homilies, is just and
 " right; and that the main Doctrines designed to be
 " taught in them, are godly and wholsom Doctrines."
 Right again. Here is the same Agreement still between
 us. Now let us see, who keeps up most to this Agree-
 ment, he, or I; He, that pleads for Resistance in some
 cases, or I, who allow it in none. You see, Sir! I
 have produced good part of the Homilies for *Obedience*,
 and *against Wilful Rebellion*, which (without one Ex-
 ception, either expressed or implied) commend in
 Letter, common Sense, and Example, Absolute Non-
 resistance to the Supreme Magistrate. Is not the Te-
 nour, or main Design, (nay, the whole of them) to shew
 People the Sin, Folly, and extreme Mischief of Resist-
 ance in any case, tho' moved on the most specious Pre-
 tence, with powerful Arguments to dissuade them from
 it? If this be not the Tenour and main Design of these
 Homilies, I despair of ever knowing, what the Tenour,
 Design, or Subject of any Author is. If this be not the
 Tenour, pray shew me what is? You may as well per-
 suade the World, that *Milton's Iconoclastes* was King
Charles's Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, as that the Homilies (the perfect
 opposites to and confounders of all manner of Resist-
 ance) are the very Picture and lively Image of that
 pretended Vertue, but real Vice. If I mistake not, (for
 a Man ought to be as sure as he can, who deals with
 such cunning People) the Tenour, or Design of any
 Author,

Author, is the Proof and Declaration of the Subject of his Book. And are not the Proof and Persuasion of Absolute Non-resistance, the main Subject of the Homilies? There is scarce any thing else in those Homilies. Should not I affront Mr. *Hoadly*, and all Men of common Sense, should I offer to say, that his late Sermons and Discourses were to be understood of an unlimited Obedience, when every Word of them is fully against it, and for Resistance in some cases? Is not a partial and qualified Obedience the design of them all? And yet the Homilies are no more for a limited Non-resistance, than Mr. *Hoadly's* Books are for an unlimited one. To say the Tenour of the Homilies is for Resistance in some cases, is an instance of such Assurance, as will not be easily paralleled. The B. of *S.* in his Conference with the D. of *T.* in the Year 1673. could not prove to his R. H. the Doctrine of Resistance in any case, from the authentick Records of the Church of *England*. He then knew it not to be there; and therefore preached the contrary Doctrine of Absolute Non-resistance, both at the *Savoy* and at *Covent-Garden*. Though he had before advised that Prince not to depend on that Doctrine of the Church in that point, for that there was a Distinction in the Matter, (an invisible one, and *in petto*) that would be found out, when Men thought they needed it. So that it is to be taken *pro confesso*, that Resistance in any case was invisible in the Homilies, till Men thought they needed it to serve a present Purpose; and then it was as plain as need to be desired. Is not that a rare Faculty, that can prove any thing out of nothing? And doubtless it was an act of great Christian Simplicity, Integrity, and discharge of Conscience to the Flock, to conceal from them this great *Arcanum*, under the fairest Insinuation, that there was no such thing, until it should be thought convenient to trust them with it. I suppose, such bright Evidence of a deeply latent Distinction and Reserve, is to be squeezed out of your inexhaustible Magazine of the Law of Nature, which (well managed) will serve for any thing a Man hath a mind to. Suppose a Married Man, marvellously
addicted

addicted to the Flesh, should be caught in Bed with a Woman that doth not very fairly belong to him, and you should charge him with Adultery from the very Letter of God's Law: Might not he as well answer you, and say; 'Tis true, the Carnal Letter of the Law is so, but the Pure Spirit of it is quite otherwise in some emergent Cases; and I have a Distinction, which I always carry about, to relieve me at a Push: For I must tell you, Sir! at present my Wife is at an unapproachable distance, and I could not stay, for the Law of Nature was very prevalent in me; I desire therefore your Excuse. I will undertake as soon to defend this Adulter~~er~~ by such a subtil Distinction and Reserve, as the violent Resister of the Supreme Magistrate; and I am sure, (but that is not my peculiar Province at present) that such an Adulterer hath, and ought to have as much Benefit and Relief from the Letter and Sence of the Law of God, as such a Resister of the Supreme Civil Magistrate. But this only by the way. Wherefore to proceed:

[*Pag. ead.*] Says Mr. *Hoadly*, “ It is ^{to be} presumed, ~~and~~ that the Homilies were not understood, at their first appearance in the World, to condemn the Resistance of Subjects to their Princes in Case of extream Necessity; both from the Principles publickly espoused by Mr. *Hooker*, the greatest Defender of the Church; and from the Acts of the Clergy in Convocation assembled, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; who esteemed it Glorious, to Assist oppressed Subjects against their Princes. And this is the stronger Argument, because it is very incredible, either that the Clergy at that time should not understand the true Meaning of this Homily; or that they should so soon contradict what they had so solemnly Subscribed to: So that here is a very *probable Demonstration*, not only that it was not intended by the Authors of it to condemn Resistance in all Cases; but also, that it was not at first understood so to do by any considerable part of the Clergy of *England*. ” But it ought to be observed; that Presumption is never to go against plain Evidence
C
and

and Sense, nor is admitted to do so in any Court. The universal Scope of the Homilies is evidently and sensibly against all manner of Resistance in all Cases; so that no Case is to be presumed to be excepted against the express Declarations to the contrary: And if the Principles of Mr. *Hooker*, and the Practices of Queen *Elizabeth's* Convocation be inconsistent with the Homilies, the Homilies (which are established by the whole Power of Church and State) ought to be the Rule of our Actions; not the Actions of any Persons, how great or numerous soever. One Line, or any just or true Inference from the Homilies, authorizing Resistance in any Case, would have been of more weight, than the inconsiderate Actions of a Thousand People. But this is not all. I have now argued only on Supposition, that every Word Mr. *Hoadly* hath said, is true. But I know not where Mr. *Hooker's* Principles approve of Resistance in any Case. To my Mind, his Opinion, That Government was founded upon Compact, doth not necessarily imply it: For if this Kingdom was now Elective, after a due Election of the King, that King would be still irresistible by all the Laws of the Land. And the Acts of the Convocation (I suppose Mr. *Hoadly* means their granting Subsidies to carry on a War, by assisting the Subjects of our Enemy, to resist their Lawful Prince, to our Martial Advantage) have been esteemed by wise and good Men not very defensible; however, (I dare say) they did not plead the Homilies in their Justification; tho' God knows, it hath been, and (for ought I see) is still like to be, (tho' that doth not make it one jot the more Lawful) the too common Practice of the World. All this is only pleading Practice against Principle; it is by Principle, (tho' all the World were against us) that we must order and justify our Practice. Mr. *Hoadly* says, the Convocation could not understand the Homilies in the Sense of absolute Non-resistance, (tho' the plain Letter and Sense of them be for it, and he hath not, nor can disprove it,) because they granted a Subsidy to our Prince, to encourage Foreign Subjects to rebel against theirs; *i. e.* because Practice might not be

See Mr. Hoadly's History,

Vol. 2. p. 24

be so very agreeable unto Principle. And yet, is all this more strange and surprizing, than to hear Bishops and Priests of the Church of *England* plead for the Lawful Mission of one Ordained only by Presbyters, contrary to the plain Sence and Meaning of the Twenty-third Article of our Religion, to which they have consented; which says, " It is not lawful for any Man " to take upon him the Office of publick Preaching, or " Ministring the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the " same: And those we ought to judge lawfully called, " and sent, which be chosen and called to this Work " by Men, who have publick Authority given unto " them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers " into the Lord's Vineyard? " And that none but Episcopally Ordained are here understood, (if any thing can be understood) is most notorious; in as much as the Church of *England* will never receive others into Clerical, (unless they take Orders from us) but only into Laical Communion. And yet have we not had Men of the Highest Rank (*cum multis aliis*) in the Church, who have asserted the Article not to exclude pretended Presbyterian Ordinations? And yet, can any thing be plainer, than that the Authentick Records of the Church of *England*, interpreted by uniform Practice, are fully against it? Are the Homilies so much for Resistance in any Case, as the Article seems for Presbyterian Ordination? And yet, tho' some of our Clergy are (at least Complementally, and by way of Civility and good Neighbourhood, out of the plenitude of their Moderation,) for the Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, no wise Man would think it a real Prejudice to the Sence of the Article, (notwithstanding their Opinions, and perhaps sometimes Occasional Practices too) taken solely, and exclusively of any other, in an Episcopal Sence. Here is the Case: The Homilies are most flagrantly against Resistance in any Case. Queen *Elizabeth's* Convocation subscribed them; yet contributed to the Assistance of the *Dutch* against their Lawful Prince, the King of *Spain*. I do not pre-

tend to justify or reconcile this. Several Clerical Church-of-England-Men now-a-days plead for the Lawfulness of Presbyterian Ordination, yet have they directly opposed it by their Assent to the Twenty-third Article of Religion: Neither can I justify, or reconcile that. If a Man would understand the Sence of a National Church in any Point, he ought to consult its Authentick and Established Doctrines, (especially when they are so plain, that it is impossible to force them to any other Sence) and not the Practices, even of the greatest Number of its Professors, whom sometimes Interest, Inadvertence, or Prejudice may incline to act contrary to their Principles. And no doubt, but that at the same time that Convocation granted these Pecuniary Aids for carrying on of Resistance abroad, some of the Members of it published and declared as much against all manner of Resistance at home. The Term, *Probable Demonstration*, is a little unintelligible to me. I always thought before, that Demonstration had been evident, and had carried the greatest Conviction with it: But now I find Mr. *Hoadly's* Demonstrations are only probable; and what is only probable in the common and usual acceptation of the Word, may not be; so there is some Comfort on my Side. This was modestly done of him; so that after all, what Mr. *Hoadly* has demonstrated from Mr. *Hooker* and the Convocation, is only probable even to himself; and I dare say, would be improbable (as to just Consequences) to far the largest part of Mankind, if they were to judge of it. These Proceedings, I have said; have been thought by divers Wise and Good Men not to be defensible. But now I add farther, in answer to Mr. *Hoadly*, that if he will take my Lord of *Sarum's* Authority for it, the Convocation might think themselves to have a much fairer Plea for their Subsidies than himself has allowed them. For we are told (in the History of the Reformation, Part. II. B. 3. p. 416.) that the King of *Spain's* keeping Garisons of Spaniards in the *Netherlands*, together with many other things, was contrary to the *Lætus Introitus*, that had been agreed to when he was received to be their Prince;

And

And that the *People finding all Terms broken with them, and that by that Agreement they were disengaged from their Obedience, if he broke those Conditions, (and not till then) did shake off his Yoke.* What Mr. Hoadly will say to this Authority, I know not; but it seems to me totally to overthrow his *probable Demonstration.* Yet it is but what he may see confirmed by other Testimonies, at the 34th Page of the learned and judicious *Defence of the Profession which the Right Reverend Father in God John Lord Bishop of Chichester, made upon his Death-Bed.* Lond. print. 1696.

[Pag. ead. & 160.] “ It is to be presumed like-
 “ wise, that in after-times, even when the Doctrin of
 “ Passive Obedience came to its height, many consi-
 “ derable Church-Men, and those esteemed the greatest
 “ Patrons of Non-resistance, never did understand the
 “ Design of that Homily to have been to condemn
 “ Resistance in all Cases. This is to be presumed, I
 “ say, from hence, that they have not been able to
 “ deny that there are possible Cases, in which Resist-
 “ ance is allowable. Many confess the same at this
 “ Day, who are yet accounted great Defenders of Non-
 “ resistance: And Dr. *Falkner* and others, have ac-
 “ knowledged the same in publick. ” Mr. Hoadly is
 again upon his Presumptions, as if he was not so sure
 of his Cause. If the greatest Patrons of Non-resistance
 have not been able to deny, that there are possible
 Cases, in which Resistance is allowable; and many
 such confess it at this Day, what Occasion is there for
 presuming upon their Evidence? If the Case be so, it is
 beyond Presumption, it is Certainty; *Demonstration*,
 somewhat beyond *probable.* But he is so modest here to
~~re~~ conceal their Names, (as well as their Arguments)
 except that of Dr. *Falkner.* And if the rest of his Evi-
 dence behind the Curtain be no more for him than Dr.
Falkner, I fear he will, he must be cast: For though
 Mr. Hoadly hath not told us in this Place, where
 Dr. *Falkner* is on his Side; yet; I presume, he means
 it in his *Christian Loyalty*; where, to the best of my
 Memory, (and I am confident I do not mistake) his
 Instance will prove only the Recital of the *Hypothesis*

of another ; I mean Bishop *Bilfon* ; and even that Bishop allows of no Resistance where the Laws forbid it ; as ours do, over and over.

[*Pag. ead.*] “ If there were an Homily absolutely
 “ condemning all Resistance in Children to the Parents, (as this is said to condemn all Resistance of
 “ Subjects to their Princes) and any one should allow
 “ of Resistance in Children, upon Supposition, that a
 “ Father should attempt their Lives ; let him never so
 “ much declare how improbable, and next to impossible
 “ he imagins it, that this should ever come to pass ;
 “ yet this Allowance is as truly a Contradiction to such
 “ an Homily, as any other Allowance can be. What
 “ I would infer from hence is this : That as considerable
 “ Patrons as Passive Obedience ever had, even in
 “ those Times, in which it was carried to the height,
 “ did not imagin, that it was the Design of the Homily
 “ against Rebellion, to condemn Resistance in all
 “ Cases : For otherwise surely they would not have
 “ contradicted their own Subscription, by allowing it in
 “ any possible Case. ” To these possible Cases I shall
 say nothing, unless they had been here laid before me.
 But this I shall say in the mean time, That the Case of
 Resisting the Supreme Civil Magistrate by the Subject,
 and of the Natural Parent by the Child, will not hold ;
 for if the Natural Parent prove unnatural to his
 Child ; the Power of the Civil, (the Superior Power,
 and Common Parent of them both) on Application,
 will relieve them ; and if in extream necessity the Child
 should repel Force with Force, this can never be proved
 lawful, unless it be upon the presumed Consent of the
 Magistrate for the same ; in as much as he would avenge
 the Injured, if he was at hand. And that even this will
 justify it, is more than Mr. *Hoadly* will ever be able to
 prove. But the Case of the Prince is still more plain,
 because he is the Supream Power on Earth, and therefore
 there can ly no Appeal against him : And doth not Mr.
Hoadly know this to be the constant and current Doctrin
 of the Homilies ? Yes, he doth in that very Homily he
 hath not thought fit to speak to, tho’ he hath Subscribed
 to

to it, as well as to the other : I mean, the Homily for *Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*, [Part II. pag. 66. lin. 37.] where begin these remarkable Words, in an Objection, and Answer thereunto : “ But peradventure some
 “ here would say, that *David* in his own defence might
 “ have killed King *Saul* lawfully, and with a safe Con-
 “ science. But holy *David* did know, that he might in
 “ no wise withstand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign Lord and
 “ King ; he did know, that he was but K. *Saul*’s Subject,
 “ though he were in great Favour with God, and his
 “ Enemy K. *Saul* out of God’s Favour. Therefore, tho’
 “ he were never so much provoked, yet he refused utterly
 “ to hurt the Lord’s Anointed ; he durst not for offend-
 “ ing God and his own Conscience, (although he had
 “ occasion and opportunity) once lay Hands upon God’s
 “ high Officer the King, whom he did know to be a Per-
 “ son reserved and kept (for his Office-sake) only to God’s
 “ Punishment and Judgment ; therefore he prayeth so oft
 “ and so earnestly, that he lay not his Hands upon the
 “ Lord’s Anointed. ” And if Mr. *Hoadly* would make
 the Parallel between Resisting the Prince and the Pa-
 rent to run smoothly, *quatuor pedibus*, he should tell us,
 it is as good Divinity and Law, if a Father prove incor-
 rigible to his Son, (and his Son must be Judge of that,
 not by a Judgment of Discretion only, but also of
 Authority) to depose and murder him, and seize upon
 his Estate, as in the like Cases to do so by my Prince.
 This Mr. *Hoadly* is obliged to do, if he would maintain
 his Parallel between resisting a violent Father and a
 violent Prince. I scarce believe him hardy enough yet,
 on the greatest Provocations, to say, If my Father is
 stark naught to me, I may therefore conscientiously knock
 him on the Head, and seize on his Estate, for my Con-
 solation ; and yet he is obliged to say so, if he would
 this way illustrate his Example of Resistance.

[Pag. 161.] Here he is presuming again, saying ;
 “ The same may be presumed from the Practice of many
 “ Great Men of unsuspected Zeal both for the Church
 “ and for the Doctrine of Passive Obedience in particu-
 “ lar ; who either joined in inviting over the Prince of

“ *Orange*, to defend this Nation against the late King
 “ *James* ; or approved of the first Motions of the late
 “ Revolution ; or went so far as to bear an Active Part
 “ in them. From which one cannot but conclude, that
 “ they did not imagin the Doctrin of the Church of
 “ *England* to be against Resistance in all Cases. ” To
 this I presume, (like a poor passive Prisoner at the Bar)
 to make a small Objection , in Point of Law : ———
 and without giving any farther Reason why, to chal-
 lenge so many of the Jury. But if the Court be pleased
 to over-rule me, and will not suffer my Challenge, but
 the good and true Men impanneled must determin the
 Cause between our Sovereign Lord the People, and Me,
 I am content, and think Myself not in much Danger : For
 since the whole Jury must unanimously agree on their
 Verdict, before they can bring me in Guilty, Mr. *Hoadly*
 knows, I am in a secure condition of Life and Limb,
 even from that Quarter.

[*Pag. ead.*] He comes to his Fourth Presumption,
 saying : “ The same may be presumed likewise from
 “ the Notions of *late*, publicly espoused by many
 “ Persons of great Authority and Reputation in the
 “ Church ; who lodge the *Kingly Power* in these Na-
 “ tions , not in the Person of the Prince, but in All
 “ who bear a Part in making our Laws : By this
 “ Means confining Passive Obedience to the Laws,
 “ and absolving from all Obligation to Non-Resistance
 “ to the Prince, acting in Contradiction to the two
 “ Houses of Parliament, or the established Laws of the
 “ Land. He says , some Notions of *late* have been
 “ espoused by many Great Ecclesiasticks, that the
 “ *Kingly Power* in these Nations is not lodged (singly)
 “ in the Person of the Prince, but in All who bear a
 “ Part in Making our Laws. ” Doth not this argue a
 little Guilt ? He says, *These are Notions espoused of late* ;
 so not the old and former Notions of the Kingdom :
 which argues, they are not the standing Law of the
 Land. And if I may make so bold , I would tell
 Mr. *Hoadly*, as little versed as I am in the Law , I will
 undertake before any Lord Chief Justice in *Europe*, to
 maintain

maintain from the universal currency of our Municipal Laws, even to this Day, that the sole Political Power of the King of *England* is inseparably annexed to his Royal Person, and no where else. But it is no wonder to me, to find Him assert a coordinate Power of Regal Authority seated in the People, who from the Homilies (than which, nothing under Heaven can be plainer against it) asserts in the People a Superior Power (and then, What is become of his Coordinate?) to the Regal, properly so called; for that they necessarily have, if they can call the Prince to an Account in his Personal and Political Capacity. Methinks, Mr. *Hoadly* miserably betrays his Cause, in saying, "Whoever reads the Homily, must *evidently see*, that the chief Design of it was not to press Obedience under this Notion, (*this Notion, as he himself confesses, taken up of late*) "but with respect to the Prince considered by himself; unless such favourable Suppositions, and qualifying Interpretations (*contrary to the Letter and Sense of every Doctrine and Law, both in Church and State; a modest Request indeed!*) "be allowed, as I have reason to fear, will be denied to me." He owns, that the Homily is evident, (*a more satisfactory Term than probable Demonstration*) that the sole Kingly Power (and consequently the Supreme irresistible, is seated in the Person of the Prince, "unless such favourable Suppositions, and qualifying Interpretations be allowed, as he hath reason to fear (*and so he hath indeed*) "will be denied him:" Such wild Suppositions, and Interpretations as he himself confesses to be but Notions of late. Is not this like Truth extorted, and Conviction? May it proceed to Conversion. Do you not think his Great Ecclesiasticks are much obliged to him? He says, the *new* Notion of the Kingly Authority (and new it is indeed) absolves the Subjects from their Allegiance, if the King acts not only in contradiction to the established Laws of the Land, but to the two Houses of Parliament; saying, "By this means confining Passive Obedience to the Laws, and absolving from all Obligation to Non-resistance to the

Prince,

“ Prince, acting in Contradiction to the two Houses of
 “ Parliament, or to the established Laws of the Land.”
 I suppose, he will prove it from the 12th and 13th of
 King *Charles II*, which Laws are in full Force to this
 Day in all Instances, (as you cannot deny) except we
 should grant you a little Relaxation in one single
 Case, of a Prince Turning Papist, or Marrying one;
 and then, *Exceptio firmat Regulam in non exceptis*. And
 they declare, “ That neither the Peers, nor Commons,
 “ nor both together, nor the People, collectively nor
 “ representatively, in *Parliament*, nor out of Parlia-
 “ ment, nor any other Persons whatsoever, have any
 “ *Coercive* Power over the Kings of *England*. And
 “ that the Sword is solely in the King’s Power; and
 “ that neither one, nor both Houses of Parliament can
 “ or lawfully may raise or levy War Offensive or DE-
 “ FENSIVE against his Majesty.” I know not
 well what he means, by the *King’s acting in Contradiction*
to the two Houses of Parliament. I hope, he is not under
 hand insinuating the Legality of an Ordinance, instead
 of an Act of Parliament. If he is, let him look to himself.

“ But this is not all, saith he, p. 162. I have to say
 “ on this head; (if it be, you have said very little) tho’
 “ this, one would think, ought to make some Persons
 “ a little more tender in their Censures, (*I must deal*
plainly and ingenuously with you, Mr. Hoadly, it raiseth my
Censure and Suspicion of Self-condemnation much more)
 “ for I shall be so bold, after all the Confidence some
 “ have expressed to the contrary, to appeal to the Ho-
 “ milies themselves; (*agreed on*) and to affirm, that
 “ it cannot be proved to have been the design of the
 “ Homily *against Rebellion* (to condemn Rebellion) to
 “ condemn that Resistance, which I have taught, or
 “ to teach that Passive Obedience, which I have con-
 “ demned.”

P. eadem he says, “ The design of the first part of this
 “ Homily is to prove, from several Texts of Scripture,
 “ the Dignity of Princes, and the Duty of Subjects,
 (*according to his Principles he should have said, The Dignity*
of Subjects, and the Duty of Princes) “ and that the most
 “ that

“ that is here inferred, is, that Subjects ought to be
 “ obedient, not only to their good and courteous, but
 “ also to their sharp and rigorous Princes.” Now here
 Mr. *Hoadly* would insinuate, as if it meant no more,
 than Submission to a Prince, that was somewhat impe-
 rious and vexatious to some of his Subjects; (for such
 may be said to be sharp and rigorous, tho’ they are not
 downright Tyrants) whereas the Instances (*P. 357.*)
 of the first Christians under the Emperor, either *Caligula*,
Claudius, or *Nero*, and of the *Jews* under *Nebuchadonosor*,
 in the *Babylonian* Captivity, (unless my Eye-sight fails
 me) are perfectly exemplary Commands from God him-
 self, to Subjects to submit patiently under the severest
 Provocations; and a demonstration to me, that the
 Compilers of the Homily produced them purely for that
 purpose. Agreeably whereunto the same Homily saith
 expressly (*P. 355.*) from Scripture, *When the wicked do*
reign, then men go to ruin; a foolish Prince destroyeth the
people; and a covetous King undoeth the subjects; (Mr. *Hoad-*
ly’s Character of a tolerable Prince, if the Homilies be
 on his side) yet such are not to be resisted with vio-
 lence, if we have Faith enough to believe this Homily
 in the following Question and Answer; and then the
 former Paragraph concludes with these Words, “ Thus
 “ speak the Scriptures, thus Experience testifieth of good
 “ and evil Princes: Princes, not only personally, but
 “ politically and extremely Evil.” But now if Mr. *H.*
 would reconcile his new Notions and the old Homilies
 together, he must prove solidly, that the *Roman* Empe-
 rors were only now and then guilty of some petty Of-
 fence against their Subjects, (though no Princes profes-
 sing Christianity since, can be proved guilty of more
 Tyranny, than those Heathen ones were; and yet their
 Subjects were obliged in conscience not to resist them)
 or that *Nebuchadonosor* never but twice or thrice invaded
 the *Liberty* and *Property* of a small number of worthless
Jews. He must prove likewise, that to *make men go to*
ruin, to destroy the people, and to undo the subjects, (Terms
 expressive of the greatest Tyranny and Desolation to
 vulgar Capacities) signify no more than a tolerably
 sharp

sharp and rigorous proceeding of the Prince, not to be coerced by his Notion of Resistance: And when he hath done this, I will leave him to be chastised by his dear Friends, the Men of *large Thoughts*, and *larger Liberties*. He proceeds, [*P. eadem & sequenti*] "Now this must be confessed by all to extend to Active, as well as to Passive Obedience; (meaning Obedience to evil Princes) "if therefore it ought not to be inferred from hence, that it was the design of this Passage, to urge the Necessity of Active Obedience in all possible cases, (which is the greatest Indignity that can be offered unto it) neither can it be inferred, that it was the design of this Passage to inculcate an Absolute Passive Obedience." Now this must be confessed by all, saith Mr. *Hoadly*; pray consider a little; for by your favour (Sir!) this is denied by all Men of Sense and Honesty; even by the one side of your sweet self Subscribing, in opposition to the other side of you obstinately Contradicting. Read your Condemnation in the second Part of the *Sermon of Obedience*, p. 67. After the plainest Declarations for Absolute Non-resistance, from the famous Example of *David*, there are these *Anti-Hoadleian* Words: "Yet let us believe undoubtedly (good Christian People) that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other, (though they be our own Fathers) if they would command us to do any thing contrary to God's Commandments. In such a case, we ought to say, with the Apostle, *We must rather obey God, than Man*. But nevertheless in that case we may not in any wise withstand violently, or rebell against our Rulers, or make any Insurrection, Sedition, or Tumults, either by force of Arms, (or otherwise) against the Anointed of the Lord, or any of his Officers: But we must in such case patiently suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the judgment of our Cause only to God." To charge the contrary as the Confession of all Mankind, what shall I call it? It is an act of the most uncommon Assurance, and ought to be treated accordingly, if there be such things in nature, as Truth, Modesty, and Cou-

rage, to be maintained. Had Mr. *Hoadly* found but the thousandth part of so much for Active Resistance, in any one particular place, there would have been no living for his Triumph; he would have given his Arguments better Titles, than of *Presumptions* and *probable Demonstrations*.

Again, [*P. eadem*] “ I grant indeed, saith he, that
 “ the Lawfulness of all Rebellion to undiscrēt and
 “ evil Governors is *absolutely* denied, but chiefly, as it
 “ is manifest, upon this foundation, Because Rebellion
 “ is the greatest of all Mischiefs, and Rebels the
 “ naughtiest of Subjects, ever readiest to rebell against
 “ the best Princes; and therefore not fit to be trusted,
 (*How? take away presently that Power you so liberally be-*
stowed?) “ or encouraged to pass any Judgment upon
 “ the Conduct of their Princes.” If the Lawfulness of
 all Rebellion to undiscrēt and evil Governors be *absolutely* denied, you yield all I contend for; for I think I have fully proved, that by such are meant, in the Sence of the Homilies, the worst of Tyrants. Your Adverb (*chiefly*) will give you no relief; for there may be several Reasons for condemning the same thing, yet no good Reason to justify it, as in the present Case of Resisting for some Causes. “ But doth this look (continues Mr. *Hoadly*) as if the same Persons, who wrote
 “ this, would have said the same against Resistance in
 “ all cases? Nay, I think it rather evident from the
 “ Account they constantly give of Rebellion and Rebels, and from this very Passage, that they would
 “ not have said the same, with respect to those Cases,
 “ in which the best of Subjects, and those, who are
 “ ever ready to obey good Princes, (*that is, if they like*
them) are generally convinced, that Resistance is
 “ necessary, not for any private Ends of their own,
 (*Who ever said so?*) “ but merely for the Defence and
 “ Preservation of the Happiness of the Publick.” Let all the World judge: Read these Lines in the fourth part of the Sermon against *Wilful Rebellion*, p. 372, 373.
 “ Though not only great Multitudes of the rude and
 “ rascal Commons, but sometimes also Men of great
 “ Wit,

“ Wit, Nobility, and Authority, have moved Rebels
 “ lions against their lawful Princes, (whereas true No-
 “ bility should most abhor such villanous, and true
 “ Wisdom should most detest such frantick Rebellion)
 “ though they should pretend sundry Causes, as the
 “ Redress of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of
 “ all other Mischiefs doth most destroy) or Reforma-
 “ tion of Religion, (whereas Rebellion is most against
 “ all true Religion) though they have made a great
 “ shew of holy Meaning, by beginning their Rebel-
 “ lions with a *counterfeit* Service of God, (as did wicked
 “ *Absalom* begin his Rebellion with Sacrificing unto
 “ God) though they display and bear about Ensigns
 “ and Banners, which are acceptable unto the rude
 “ and ignorant common People, great multitudes of
 “ whom by such false Pretences and Shews they do
 “ deceive, and draw unto them: Yet were the multi-
 “ tudes of the Rebels *never so huge and great, the Cap-*
 “ *tains never so noble, politick and witty, the Pretences*
 “ *feigned to be never so good and holy,* yet the speedy
 “ overthrow of all Rebels, of what Number, State, or
 “ Condition soever they were, or what Colour or
 “ Cause soever they pretended, is, and ever hath been
 “ such, that God thereby doth shew, (*read attentively*)
 “ that he alloweth neither the Dignity of any Person,
 “ nor the Multitude of any People, nor the Weight of
 “ any Cause, as sufficient for the which the Subjects
 “ may move Rebellion against their Princes.” Can
 Mr. Hoadly stand against this Lightning in his Face?
 The greatest Act of Charity is to believe, he hath
 taken all by Tradition, and that he never read the
 Homilies either before, or since his Subscription. Do
 you find here, that either *Lords or Commons are trusted,*
or encouraged to pass any Judgment on the Conduct of their
Princes? I mean a Judgment of Authority, not of
 Discretion. Is not the plain contrary declared in as
 significant Terms, as the Invention of Man is capable
 of producing? Correspondently to which doth not the
 first part of this Homily say, p. 355. “ What a peri-
 “ lous thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the
 “ Judgment,

“ Judgment, which Prince is wise and godly, and his
 “ Government good, and which is otherwise; as tho’
 “ the Foot must judge of the Head: An Enterprife
 “ very heinous, and must needs breed Rebellion.” He
 says, the Words *undiscreet and evil Governors*, are ca-
 pable of infinite degrees, *p. eadem*. They may be so,
 but the Homilies declare them to be taken in the ut-
 most Latitude and Extent, or else there is no Meaning
 in Words.

Again, saith he; *p. 164*. “ It is indeed declared,
 “ That a Rebel is worse than the worst Prince, and
 “ Rebellion worse than the worst Government of the
 “ worst Prince, that hitherto hath been: But this ra-
 “ ther convinceth me, that they would not have said
 “ the same of all Resistance, (*tho’ they do say it in as*
plain Words as can be framed) “ than make me con-
 “ clude the contrary” (*because they do.*) That is, it is
 declared, and it is not declared. Cannot this Man
 prove any thing at this rate? and by any Medium?
 Saith the Homily, in utter Abhorrence of Resistance of
 all Sorts and for all Causes, a *Rebel*, that is, one who useth
 violence to his Prince, (for of such, as every one sees,
 is the whole Scope of the Homilies) is worse than the
 worst Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst Go-
 vernment of the worst Prince, that hitherto hath been.
 No, saith he, it means, that a bad Prince is worse
 than the worst Rebel; and Rebellion better than the
 bad Government of such a Prince. Is not this to pro-
 claim to the World, it ought not to believe one Word
 Mr. *Hoadly* says on this subject, purely because he says
 it? To understand that a Rebel is better than a bad
 and tyrannical Prince from these Words, That a *Rebel*
is worse, &c. is it not (what is storied of Witches in
 relation to their Prayers) to read the Lines backwards
 before we can apprehend the Sence of them? “ No-
 “ thing can be more evident, saith he, than that
 “ this cannot be affirmed of some Instances of Resist-
 “ ance, because the Authors of this Homily give after-
 “ wards such an account of Rebellion, and of Rebels,
 “ as doth not at all touch the case of Resistance for the
 “ necessary

" necessary Defence of Publick Happiness, but doth,
 " indeed wholly exempt that from the Imputation of
 " Rebellion, or from being concerned in what they
 " say against it." Nothing can be more evident,
 than that the Homilies do mean, that Submission to
 the worst Prince, under the greatest Provocations, is
 more eligible, than the least violent Resistance main-
 tained by Principle; and therefore they exclude all
 manner of Resistance: For if Resistance be once al-
 lowed by Principle on the greatest Pretence, it will be
 frequently undertaken on the slightest, if Power and
 Opportunity concur; and therefore the Homily, and
 the Laws of God and Man, eternally exclude it on all
 accounts; for on supposition of an unavoidable Evil,
 the least is to be chose and endured: Tyranny before
 Rebellion. What is generally better, is for the publick
 and common Good of Mankind. And it is generally
 better to suffer patiently under the greatest Tyrant,
 than by resisting to try for Redress; for when Arms
 are once raised, it is seldom in the power of those,
 who raise them, to cause them to be laid down, when
 they please: However it is a great uncertainty, which
 no wise Man would commend or follow. For the
 Truth of it I appeal to the Histories of the World, and
 let them tell, which hath shed most Blood, the Cruel-
 ty of Tyrants, or the Practice of Resisting them. Vio-
 lent Resistance therefore is *toto genere* unlawful, and so
 the Homilies expressly teach. But you shall no more
 take my word for it, than you should Mr. Hoadly's.
 Repeat therefore out of the fourth part of the Sermon
 against *Wilful Rebellion*, p. 373. these Words; " God
 " thereby, saith the Homily, (speaking of the fearful
 " End of Rebels) doth shew, that he alloweth neither
 " the Dignity of any Person, nor the Multitude of any
 " People, nor the Weight of any Cause, (*methinks*
this might satisfy a moderate Man) " as sufficient for
 " the which Subjects may move Rebellion against
 " their Princes." Doth not the Homily here plainly
 imply, that the least Resistance, and for the most spe-
 cious Cause maintained on Principle, is worse than
 Tyranny?

Tyranny? And I hope a Cause is to be maintained by Principles, and not by extraordinary and unforeseen Chances and Accidents, such as Mr. *Hoadly* disputes for in this case. What doth this Author mean by saying, (*sure, he is at his Prayers backwards again!*) “The Authors of this Homily give afterwards such an account of Rebellion, and of Rebels, as doth not at all touch the Case of Resistance for the necessary Defence of Publick Happiness?” Do they not say at large, in Periods before quoted, “That though Men of great Wit, Nobility, and Authority, have moved rebellions against their lawful Princes, to redress the Commonwealth, to reform Religion,” &c. yet it was Rebellion still? Was ever a Rebellion yet moved against the Supreme Magistrate, but under the Notion of the Publick Good and Happiness? Not one in the World; nor never will be. No Man pretends to it for the Redress of his private Injuries; that would look too narrow and sneaking, tho’ *Self* is commonly at the bottom of all: And if it prove successful, let me see the Man that will not say or swear afterwards, that it was originally designed for the Publick Good. Besides, (continues he) in this very place, Rebellion is spoken of, as an unfit Medicine to reform any small Lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little Grievs in Government: Which cannot be applied to that Resistance, (*yes, it can, and must, if it be applied to all Resistance*) “which is made to preserve a State from that Ruin, which is evident and certain without it.” But Mr. *Hoadly*! it is not over-fair to omit the following two Lines; but then indeed your whole Plot had been discovered and spoiled. He quotes these Words, (tho’ what hath been said just before, is enough to destroy his Argument with any reasonable Man) “That Rebellion is an unfit Medicine to reform any small Lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little Grievs in Government;” thinking thereby to deceive the unwary Reader, as if the Homily meant, that because Resistance was a Medicine unfit to reform small Faults in a Prince, or Government, ~~that~~ therefore it followed, that

that it was a very fit and proper Medicine in great and extreme Abuses of the Sovereign Authority : Whereas the two Lines immediately following, put the matter of Absolute Non-resistance beyond dispute ; saying, “ Such lewd Remedies (*of Resistance*) being far worse (*there is no comparison between them*) “ than ANY “ OTHER Maladies and Disorders, that *can be* in the “ Body of the Commonwealth.” This I hope is spoken Absolute enough. “ It is here said likewise, saith he, “ that we must pray for the Prince, whether good or “ evil, *i. e.* as it is here explained, for his continuance “ and increase in Goodness, if he be good ; and for his “ Amendment, if he be evil : Which I think (*think again, second Thoughts, they say, are best*) “ is as consistent with Defending our selves from being ruined “ by him, as the Praying in like manner for our Enemies, is with our defending our selves against them.” If he means (as I cannot perceive what he means else) that we have as much Authority to defend our selves by violent Resistance against our tyrannical Prince, as against our Enemies, because we are obliged to pray as much for the one, as for the other ; I must tell him, he is under a great Mistake : For tho’ there is the same Absolute Command for Praying for our Enemies, as there is for Absolute Obedience to our Prince ; yet the Cases of Passive Obedience are unequal. The whole Law and Practice of the World have ever been for lawful Wars under lawful Princes against publick Enemies ; as particularly God commanded his beloved People the Jews, to fight with, and destroy the Idolatrous Nations ; whereas there is no one Example or Command in the Old Testament, for Subjects to rise up against their natural Prince, in any case. The like allowance has also been made for Self-defence, (where the Power of the Magistrate could not be timely called in to the Assistance of the injured Person) against private Assaults ; and S. John Baptist fairly owned the lawfulness of Violence in some cases, when he gave the Soldiers good Advice, without condemning their Character or Profession. But as for Resistance to the Prince,

you

you have no Exception in Scripture, Reason, or Law, to countenance, much less to authorise it. And I am sure, the Supreme Power in every Nation is necessarily, and by all Laws irresistible: If it were not so, it could not be the Supreme Power; and that Supreme Power here, is lodged in our King or Queen. Methinks it is a strange piece of Assurance in Mr. *Hoadly*, when the Homily had but just before, p. 356. answered the Objection, " But what if the Prince be undiscreeet and
 " evil indeed, and is also evident to all Mens Eyes that
 " he is so? by telling us, That we ought by no means
 " to resist him, but to pray for his Conversion and
 " Amendment;" It is a strange piece of Assurance, I say, to tell us after this, that yet we may do it, as well as resist a *Tory* or *Rapparee*; and by parity of Reason that by *Praying for his Amendment*, is meant, *that God will enable you to destroy him*, if you can, for fear he should serve you so first. The Profession of which Doctrine of Resistance, and his just Suspicion and Jealousy, that you will put it into practice on occasion, is the likeliest way to provoke him to it.

[Pag. 165.] At the end of the Homily, saith he, " The Wickedness of the Rebellion then on foot, is set forth, with a principal View to which, and the Popish Pretences for Rebellion, this Homily was compiled; which would make one apt to think it very hard, to urge the Doctrin of it against such a Resistance as hath been found necessary for Preservation of the Protestant Religion, and the Guarding against these same Popish Enemies, at whom this Doctrin was chiefly directed. " That is to say, because the Compilers of the Homily had then in View a Rebellion carrying on by Papists, therefore they could never be supposed to condemn one carried on by Protestants at any time on the same Principles. For let me ask; Do none else ever use the same Pretences, how averse soever they profess themselves to Popery? Consult a while an ingenious Paper on this Subject, entituled, *Two Sticks made one, or, the Devil upon Dun.* Rebellion is Rebellion, whoever be guilty of it; and Religion hath nothing to

do in it. Have you forgot these few Words in this Homily,
 [Pt. 4. p. 373.] Rebellion is most against all true Religion,
 (and therefore is not allowable in, or for it;) or cannot you
 remember two Leaves farther in your own Book, where
 [p. 168.] you say: "They speak likewise here of the Pre-
 "tences used by Rebels, particularly that of Religion,
 " (which I have not concerned my self with.)? And yet
 you do concern your self with it, and make it a lau-
 dable Cause of Resisting the Supreme Magistrate;
 when you say but two Leaves before, [viz. Pag. 165.]
 "It would make one apt to think it very hard, to urge
 "the Doctrin of it against such a Resistance as hath
 "been found necessary for Preservation of the Protestant
 "Religion." So, forgetful Mr. Hoadly! Within the
 compass of two Leaves! What follows to the end of
 the Paragraph, is a Continuation of the Argument of
 Dominion being founded in Grace: For if the Homilies,
 in injoining Absolute Obedience, had only respect to
 the Prince, as being of the Reformed Religion, it must be
 so, if Resistance be found necessary for Preservation of the
 Protestant Religion; and you know what a Papist is to
 us, the same we are to them. Would not this in the in-
 trinsick Merits of the Cause, (had they pleaded it,) have
 been an excellent Vindication of the Powder-Traitors, or
 any other *Romish* ones, who thought their Religion as true,
 as we think ours, and as justly to be defended or promoted
 by War or Weapons? But I trust, *We have not so learned Christ.*

[Pag. 165.] He comes to consider the Second Part of
 this Homily, and says, "The Design of it is, to alledge
 "one Example or two out of the holy Scriptures, of the
 "Obedience of Subjects, not only to their good and
 "gracious Governors, but also unto their evil and unkind
 "Princes; as it is there expressed. And this will help
 "very much towards our judging what sort of Disobe-
 "dience it was, which the Authors designed to condemn.
 "Now the first and chief Example here alledged, is that
 "of David, in his Behaviour towards Saul. And as to
 "this, it is fully sufficient to remark, that the Cause
 "between Saul and David being purely Personal, and
 "of a Private Concern; and the Charge against Saul
 "relating

relating meerly to his Personal Vices; all that can follow from hence, supposing the Example of *David* to oblige our Conscience, (*he doth not fairly tell you, it doth*) is this, That it is not lawful for Subjects to endeavour to dethrone, or murder a Prince for Vices meerly Personal, or on any Account of a Private Nature. And can Mr. *Hoadly* believe, that the Case of *Saul* and *David* in all its Circumstances, was purely Personal? No, he cannot, nor no Man believes that he can; or at least that he can believe, the Homilies mean no more. Can he read the Demands and Answers in this Case, and not believe the Compilers of the Homily to understand them in the Sence of the Common Case of all Subjects under the Administration of the worst Princes? All Injuries are in some sence Personal; in as much as a Community can no more suffer, except in its Individuals, than Universals can subsist without their Particulars. So, that if a King may not be resisted for Private and Personal Injuries, he may not for Publick and Political ones; and if he may for Political, he may for Personal; for the Case of one, is the Case of all: And he, that can destroy me and my Family to day, without my daring to resist him, may destroy my Neighbours to morrow, and so on, until he hath finished his Work. Read the Demands and Answers, and explain them to me (if you can) in any other Sence, than of absolute Non-resistance to the worst of Princes under the Calamity of National and Political Evils. To read them to you, is enough to confute you, without any other Argument: I have done it before in this Paper, and shall now call on you again to explain them, so as to make them quadrate with your Sence of Private and Personal Injuries. They run thus: " Now let *David* answer to such Demands, as Men desirous of Rebellion do use to make. Shall not we, specially being so good as we are, rise and rebel against a Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy, and therefore likely not to prosper either in War or Peace, but to be hurtful and pernicious to the Commonwealth? No, faith good and godly *David*, God's

“ and *such a King's* faithful Subject : and so convicting
 “ such Subjects as attempt any Rebellion against such a
 “ King, to be neither good Subjects, nor good Men. But
 “ say they, shall we not rise and rebel against so unkind
 “ a Prince, nothing considering or regarding our true,
 “ faithful, and painful Service, or the Safeguard of our
 “ Posterity ? No, saith good *David*, whom no such
 “ Unkindness could cause to forsake his due Obedience
 “ to his Sovereign. Shall we not, say they, rise and
 “ rebel against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy,
 “ that seeketh our Lives ? No, saith godly *David*,
 “ who had learned the Lesson that our Saviour after-
 “ ward plainly taught, that we should do no Hurt
 “ to our Fellow-Subjects, tho' they hate us, and be
 “ our Enemies, much less unto our Prince, tho' he
 “ were our Enemy. Shall we not assemble an Army
 “ of such good Fellows, as we are, and by hazarding
 “ our Lives, and the Lives of such as shall withstand
 “ us, and withal hazarding the whole Estate of our
 “ Country, remove so naughty a Prince ? No, saith
 “ godly *David*; for I, when I might, without assem-
 “ bling Force, or Number of Men, without Tumult,
 “ or Hazard of any Man's Life, or shedding of any drop
 “ of Blood, have delivered my Self, and *my Country*, of
 “ an Evil Prince, yet would I not do it. Are not
 “ they, say some, lusty and courageous Captains, va-
 “ liant Men of Stomach, and good Men's Bodies, that
 “ do venture by Force to Kill and Depose their King,
 “ being a naughty Prince, and their mortal Enemy ?
 “ They may be as lusty and courageous as they list, yet
 “ saith godly *David*, they can be no good nor godly
 “ Men that so do: for I not only have rebuked, but also
 “ commanded him to be slain, as a wicked Man,
 “ which slew King *Saul*, mine Enemy; tho' he being weary
 “ of his Life for the loss of the Victory against his Enemies,
 “ desired that Man to slay him. What shall we then
 “ do to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us,
 “ hated of God, hurtful to the Commonwealth, &c.
 “ lay no violent Hands upon him, saith good *David*,
 “ but let him live, until God appoint and work his
 “ End,

“ End, either by natural Death, or in War, by lawful
 “ Enemies, not by trayterous Subjects. And which is
 very observable, immediately after these Demands and
 Answers, saith the Homily; [Pag. 362.] “ Thus
 “ would godly *David* make answer: and *St. Paul*, as
 “ ye have heard before, willeth us to pray for *such a*
 “ *Prince.* ” Which demonstrates, that the Compilers
 of it did plainly understand the Words of *St. Paul* to
 be meant of Obedience to the most cruel and tyranni-
 cal Prince; and that Mr. *Hoadly* must know they did
 so, tho’ he could Subscribe and Retract (backwards and
 forwards) but not Own it, for valuable Considera-
 tions. Mr. *Hoadly* saith, the Case of *David* was purely
 Personal. Now *Saul*, in the Prosecution of his Malice
 against *David*, at one time slew 85 of the Priests, and
 destroyed a whole City for their sakes, together with all
 that belonged to it, Women, Children, and Cattel;
 (read the History in the first Book of *Samuel*) for inno-
 cently favouring and assisting *David*; and tho’ *David*
 had afterwards at the Cave of *Engedi*, and in the Camp,
 an Opportunity of delivering himself and his Country,
 (his Country, saith the Homily, so that the Compilers thought
such Cases to be a common and political Infraction on the
Rights of the Jews) from so ingrateful a Tyrant, yet
 he could not be persuaded to be so *Glorious a Deliverer*,
 but confesses, he could not stretch forth his Hand a-
 gainst the Lord’s Anointed, and be guiltless. Did any
 Man before hear of such Injuries, purely personal and
 private? At this rate all Injuries are personal and
 private. I fear, Mr. *Hoadly*! if your Prince should
 do but half so much Injury in her Kingdom, you
 would quickly tell her, She must appear before your
 Judgment-Seat, and answer to such things as you
 would heavily lay to her Charge. If the case of *David*
 was only a case of Injuries, of a quality purely private
 and personal, then a Prince may knock half his Clergy
 on the Head, and *Glenco* a Clan or two, and yet still
 be the irresistible Anointed of the Lord: And never
 to be otherwise, except when we have dismal Appre-
 hensions (*O terrible! who can bear the Thoughts of it?*)

that he will swallow the Nation at one single Gulp, or (like the poor distracted *Irish*, since you was born) with an handful of Men massacre the whole Nation in one Night. He says, " These are all Examples (of which the Case of *David* is the first and most pertinent) of private Persons, submitting in Instances not inconsistent with the Publick Good of that Nation they belonged to." Then I perceive it is not inconsistent with the Publick Good of a Kingdom, (at least it is not worth vindicating by these meek Patriots) to have several Hundred of its Subjects at one time inhumanly Butchered at the Will of a single Person; (as was the Case of the Priests, and their City *Nob*) for it is most evident, that after all these national Injuries, (*Mr. Hoadly may generously call them little and private ones, if he please*) *David*, tho' he had all the external Signs of Providence on his side, (good Providence, that often is made use of to help out at a dead List, and is a *Turkish* Argument for any Christian thing) however refused it, and confessed, if he had not, he should have been guilty of the foulest Rebellion. Is this your way, *Mr. Hoadly!* of defending *Liberty* and *Property*? Pray, Sir! consider now, whether that be true, which you say in the latter end of this Page, " That there is not the least shadow of a difference between the Doctrine I have taught, and this second part of the Homily;" or indeed, whether every Word you have said, be not the faintest Shadows, without the least Solidity or Substance, and whether it doth not entirely contradict the whole Sence of the Homily.

I proceed next to his Reconciliation of the third part of this Homily with his Hypothesis. He says, *p. 167.* " It is remarkable, that in their Account of Rebels, they speak of a few Subjects, out of a Luciferian Pride and Presumption, setting themselves up against the Majesty of their Prince, against the Wisdom of the Counsellors, against the Power and Force of all the Nobility, and the faithful Subjects and People of the whole Realm, From whence it still more plainly

“ plainly appears (*plainer and plainer without doubt*)
 “ that it was not the design of this Homily, to con-
 “ demn such a Resistance as is founded entirely upon
 “ the Publick Good; especially if it be judged neces-
 “ sary by the Counsellors, Nobility, and main Body
 “ of the whole Nation.” Now a plain-dealing Man
 reading this of Mr. *Hoadly*’s would be apt to conclude,
 (if he never saw the Homilies) that (according to them)
 Rebellion could be no other than a Resistance of the
 Magistrate by a few hot-headed People, for personal
 Causes, either real or pretended: But not so, when the
 greater or nobler part of the Subjects should do it grave-
 ly and demurely for the Publick Good. But this is
 spoke only *ad captandum Populum*, contrary to the Know-
 ledge and Conscience of this Author. Read but these
 Words in the fourth and next part of this Homily, *p. 372*,
373. (pray pardon me that I am forced to repeat) and
 you will see. “ Though not only great Multitudes of
 “ the rude and rascal Commons, but sometime also
 “ Men of great *Wit*, *Nobility*, and *Authority*, have mo-
 “ ved rebellions against their lawful Princes, (whereas
 “ true *Nobility* should most abhor such villanous, and
 “ true *Wisdom* should most detest such frantick Rebel-
 “ lion) though they should pretend sundry Causes, as
 “ the Redress of the Commonwealth, (which Rebel-
 “ lion of all other Mischiefs doth most destroy) or Re-
 “ formation of Religion, (whereas Rebellion is most
 “ against all true Religion) though they have made a
 “ great shew of holy Meaning, by beginning their Re-
 “ bellions with a counterfeit Service of God, (as did
 “ *wicked Absalom* begin his Rebellion with Sacrificing
 “ unto God) though they display and bear about En-
 “ signs and Banners, which are acceptable unto the
 “ rude ignorant common People, great Multitudes of
 “ whom by such false Pretences and Shews they do
 “ deceive, and draw unto them, yet were the Multi-
 “ tudes of the Rebels never so *huge* and *great*, the Cap-
 “ tains never so *noble*, politick, and witty, the Preten-
 “ ces feigned to be never so *good* and *holy*, yet the
 “ speedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what *Number*,
 “ *State*,

“ *State, or Condition* soever they were, or what *Colour*
 “ or *Cause* soever they pretended, is, and ever hath been
 “ such, that God thereby doth shew, that he alloweth
 “ neither the *Dignity of any Person*, nor the *Multitude of*
 “ any *People*, nor the *Weight of any Cause*, as sufficient
 “ for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion a-
 “ gainst their Princes.” Do not these very Words ex-
 pressly condemn such a Resistance, as is said to be found-
 ed on the *Publick Good* both of Church and State, by
 Men of great Wit, Nobility, and Authority, although it be
 judged necessary by the Counsellors, Nobility, and main Body
 of the Nation? It could not be a successful Rebellion,
 without the main Body of the Nation; and no Rebel-
 lion was ever yet, or can be raised, but under the ap-
 pearance of the Publick Good: People will not come
 into it, till they are made to believe so. The Sence of the
 Homily, is, That sometimes Rebellion is raised by the
 meaner sort of People, sometimes by the nobler, but
 that a violent Resistance of our Prince by either, is that
 Rebellion: And when it is raised by the nobler and
 better sort, it is the more scandalous and wicked; say-
 ing, “ Whereas true Nobility should most abhor such
 “ villanous, and true Wisdom should most detest such
 “ frantick Rebellion;” meaning the violent Resistance
 of the Prince in any Case, or for any Cause, as the Ho-
 milies literally forbid.

“ In the fourth part, saith he, [*P. eadem & sequente*]
 “ the Authors produce Instances of Rebellion, which
 “ are all Instances of Resistance to good Governors,
 “ grounded upon base and private Motives: Which
 “ makes it yet more probable, that their design was
 “ not to condemn such Self-defence in any People, as
 “ is manifestly necessary for their own Preservation.”
 Dares Mr. Hoadly stand to this? Hath he forgot the
 Cases of the *Jews* under *Nebuchadonosor*, and of the
 Primitive Christians under the *Roman Emperors*, signi-
 ficantly related in the first part of this Sermon? Either
 Self-defence (called manifestly necessary for our Pre-
 servation) is perfect Cant, (as indeed it is, when it
 means Violence opposed to the Supreme Magistrate, as

is the plain Sence of the Homilies) or necessary Self-defence will not justify Resistance against the greatest Tyrant. I refer you to these Words, in p. 375. " Shall the old Christians, by S. Paul's Exhortation, pray for Caligula, Claudius, or Nero? Shall the Jews pray for Nebuchadonosor? These Emperors and Kings being Strangers unto them, being Pagans and Infidels, being Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppressors of them, and Destroyers of their Country, Countrymen and Kinsmen, the Burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities, and Temples? And shall not we pray for, &c." No, bring him to the Block, if we have a godly Jealousy that he is in Rebellion against us. " Is it probable now, good Sir! that because the Authors produce Instances of Rebellion, which are all Instances of Resistance to good Governors, grounded upon base and private Motives, that therefore it makes it yet more probable, that their design was not to condemn such Self-defence in any People, as is manifestly necessary for their own Preservation? He says, They speak likewise here of the Pretences used by Rebels, particularly that of Religion, (which I have not concerned my self with) and that of the Redress of the Commonwealth, in treating of which, they do not say that there are no Cases, in which Resistance may be for the Good of the Commonwealth." Do they not plainly signify so much to the People, (and even Mr. Hoadly may be justly supposed not to have forgot it, when he useth almost the same Words in speaking of Resistance, raised for the sake of Religion, and for the Redress of the Commonwealth) where speaking of the general Misfortune of all Rebels, even in this Life, [p. 373.] they say thus: " Yet the speedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what Number, State, or Condition soever they were, or what colour of Cause soever they pretended, is and ever hath been such, that God thereby doth shew, that he alloweth neither the Dignity of any Person, nor the Multitude of any People, nor the Weight of any Cause, as sufficient for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion against their Princes?" Indeed (Sir!) were it not to oblige

oblige you, and perform my Promise, I would overlook and despise such sorry, inconsistent, and contradictory Stuff.

[*P. eadem*] “ In the two remaining parts of this Homily, saith he, the most usual Causes of Rebellion are set forth, *viz. Ambition and Ignorance*: From whence it will again appear evident, that the design of the Authors was not against such a Resistance, as is manifestly necessary for the Publick Good; but against Rebellion founded upon private Ambition, and gross Ignorance.” And are not *Ambition and Ignorance* such Causes of Rebellion, whether it be raised by *Papists* or *Fanaticks*? The Principles and Causes of Rebellion are still the same, let them come from what Quarter they will: Was not the Protestant Rebellion of 41 as much caused by Ambition and Ignorance, as the *Spanish Invasion* (encouraged by some of our Popish Subjects) 1588. And cannot the whole World in one Century afford one single Instance more? Had the Church and State (after the Restauration of K. *Charles* the Second) abolished our Homilies against Rebellion, and framed new ones as much against all Resistance, as the former, and they had had only a plain reference to the Rebellion, then just extinguished, would it have been thought a good Plea for the *Papists* in the *Popish Plot* to have cried, These Homilies could never design to affect them; for that they plainly referred to a *Fanatick Rebellion* and no other? And that those very Homilies were thought even by K. *William* (tho’ the Rebellion in K. *Charles*’s Days was carried on, *not only by great Multitudes of the rude and rascal Commons, but also by Men of Wit, Nobility, and Authority too*) to condemn all manner of Resistance, (whether promoted by *Papist*, or *Puritan*) may be collected from hence, that the two first parts of the Homily against *Wilful Rebellion*, (the most flaming parts of that Sermon against Resistance of all Characters and Denominations) were ordered then to be read, (in case of no Sermon composed by the Priest on the same subject) and are continued by the same Authority unto this Day, on every 30th day of *January*. Was not the Rebellion of

41 (if I dare so call it) raised under the appearance and profession of the necessary Publick Good? Some things in the Administration were out of order, and wanted some small Redress. The People fly to Arms; and tho' Redress was made, and Compensation super-abundant, yet still it went on for the Publick Good. That was the Word. The ambitious and designing Men knew otherwise, but would persuade the ignorant and credulous it was so. Were not *Ambition* and *Ignorance* here the Causes of a Rebellion, which was not Popish, tho' carried on by Popish Principles, and much encouraged and assisted by divers of that Party? All the Laws of God and Man condemn Resistance in any case, for that the Remedy (an hundred to one) is worse than the Disease. And tho' a Man should have Power enough to oppose his Prince, and should do it only upon the greatest Provocations; yet if he be overcome, he will receive the due Punishment of his Sin here, (beside the after-reckoning) and if he should himself conquer, yet is he not sure, he can lay the Devil of Rebellions Power, he hath once raised. Remember 41 again. "In all which, (continues Mr. Hoadly) "there is no case put of a whole Nation in imminent Danger of Ruin." Read again in the first part of the Homily against *Wilful Rebellion*, p. 357. the Cases of the Primitive Christians, under the persecuting *Roman* Emperors, and of the *Jews*, under the *Babylonian* Tyrant; where the last is said to have *Slain their King, Nobles, Parents, Children and Kinsfolks; to have burnt their Country, Cities, &c.* (which Mr. Hoadly will hardly allow to be but tolerable and personal Injuries) and both *Babylonian* and *Roman* Princes are said to be *Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppressors of them, &c.* which yet both *Jews* and *Christians* (in the full Sence of the Homilies at least) are forbid in any wise to resist. And if those People and Nations could not be said to be in imminent Danger of Ruin, and to have a noble Title to Mr. Hoadly's Benefit of Resistance; (howsoever here forbid to resist, unless praying for, be resisting of such Tyrants) I say, if those People and Nations could not be said to be in imminent Danger of Ruin, (not the whole

whole Nation in a strict Sence, for that is equally impossible every where, unless you can suppose at the same time an universal Massacre of all Parties) I defy Mr. *Hoadly* or you (his rural Proxy) to shew me one Historical Account of the most tyrannical Popish Prince, that ought to be resisted. If these respective States were not in imminent Danger from *Nebuchadonisor*, and some of the *Roman* Emperors, then no State in the World can be, from the most cruel *Popish* Tyrant, and consequently none such are to be resisted with Violence. Will you allow, Sir! that a *Popish* Prince may torment his Subjects one twentieth part so much, as *Nero* did the Christians, and *Nebuchadonisor* the *Jews*, before you suffer them to turn back and resist? and then I will say something more to you? Thus much for Mr. *Hoadly*, and his fast Friend the Homilies. I have nothing more to say, only to two or three Words in his Recapitulation.

“ It appears, saith he, from the general Expressions made use of, that the Authors no more intended in it Absolute Passive, than Absolute Active Obedience. “ But I say, from a particular Expression in the Homily of Obedience, (perhaps that Homily is not Canonical with Mr. *Hoadly*, because in his *Vindication* he hath slipt it) they plainly intended such a thing.” Read these Lines, (I am forced often to repeat, if not to convert, yet to shame, if possible) p. 67. “ Yet let us believe undoubtedly (good Christian People) that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other, (though they be our own Fathers) if they would command us to do any thing contrary to God’s Commandments. In such a case we ought to say, with the Apostle, *We must rather obey God, than Man*. But nevertheless in that case we may not in any wise withstand violently, or rebell against Rulers, or make any Insurrection, Sedition or Tumults, either by force of Arms, (or otherwise) against the Anointed of the Lord, or any of his Officers: But we must in such case patiently suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the judgment of our Cause only to God.” Is Active Obedience here commanded as much as Passive? Mr. *Hoadly*! this is

intolerable. This is (like *Bellarmino*, by the help of the Papal Authority) to make Vice, Vertue; and Vertue, Vice, at your Sacred Word; and by the Plenitude of your Power, to make any thing signify any thing, or every thing, or nothing, (tho' never so distant and contrary) according as your Holiness is disposed. "Again, saith he, " it appears from the Words frequently used, " and the Examples alledged, that they chiefly designed " their Doctrine of Non-resistance with respect to good " Princes, or such as were only guilty of personal Vices, " or of Instances of Injustice of a private Nature; not " of any manifest Attempts to ruin the Constitution " and Nation committed to their Charge." Again, say I, from the Words frequently used, and the Examples alledged, that they wholly designed their Doctrine for Non-resistance to the worst, as well as to the best Princes, unless to resist in *no Case*, signifies to resist in some Case; and to resist for *no Cause*, to resist for some Cause; or that *Caligula*, *Claudius*, *Nero*, or *Nebuchadonosor* were passable Princes; or that when *Saul* slew almost one hundred of the Priests, and all living Creatures in one whole City for their sakes, it was but a tolerable and personal Injury. He says, " That it was " not their Design, or in their Thoughts to condemn " such a Resistance, as is founded entirely upon the " Publick Security, but that founded upon base and " unworthy Motives." Is not this to tax the Convocation with Self-condemnation, (and the Parliament too, which gave a Civil Sanction to the Homilies) and to tell the World, they do not mean what they plainly say, when they condemn all manner of Resistance upon any Motive or Pretence whatever? Mr. *Hoadly*, perhaps, would take it ill, if any one should say, He is self-condemned; and yet it is not in my power (for tho' a Man may act what he will, he cannot think what he will) to believe otherwise. He says, The Authors of the Homilies do not mean, what they plainly say; and yet it is impossible for him, or the Wit of Angels or Men to prove it. I say, he professes one thing, and subscribes another; and yet pretends to stand

stand by, and reconcile that Subscription with that Profession. Whether I have proved my Charge, I leave you or any one else to judge. “ And if after so plain a Demonstration (continues he) that I have not contradicted the main Tenour and Design of this Homily, any one shall think it sufficient to produce any little piece of a Sentence brought in by the bye, which is in appearance against me, considered by it self, it will not much concern me.” No, I dare say, you are a Man of too much Mettle, to yield to any Proofs in this case. Now would not a Man (without seeing the Homily) presently imagine, that the whole Tenour of that Homily, (and of the other too) had been for Obedience to only good or tolerable Princes, but for Resistance to very bad ones; with (perhaps) some dark and obscure part of a Sentence intermixt, which might seem (inconsistently) now and then to favour the Case of Absolute Non-resistance? Would not a Man in his Wits think so by Mr. *Hoadly*’s invincible Courage? And yet the whole Tenour, Scope, and Design of these Homilies, are for Absolute Non-resistance without the least Exception, or Reserve by the bye, or else Mr. *Hoadly*, and some few (excessively few) of his undermining Moles are the only *Lyncei* in the World. Pray, try your Hand, and see, where you can shew the Tenour of the Homilies in any case of Extremity, to be for Resistance. “ The only Reply, (concludes he) to what I have here offered, must be to shew, either that the Subscription imports more than an Agreement to the chief Doctrines and main Tenour of the Homilies; (*it is enough for me that it certainly imports so much*) “ or that my Doctrine is against the main Tenour of the whole Homily against Rebellion.” Whether I have done that, is left to your Examination.

Thus, Sir! have I performed my Promise unto you, and expecting the Performance of yours, in shewing me, either where I have been defective in the omission of one material Argument brought by you, or Mr. *Hoadly* (your Champion) in relation to Resistance and the Homilies, (which is the only Subject at present of dispute between

between us) or in not thoroughly answering those I have examined, I remain

Reverend Sir!

Your affectionate Friend and faithful Servant

July 3. 1710.

Semper Idem.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHereas the Author of this Letter hath been credibly informed, that the Person concerned in it hath frequently and publickly boasted, that he has an unanswerable Reply to it, and as perfect in its kind as ever was extant, and has been dared and challenged by him to a Publication of what is here written, with Promise of as publick an Answer to it; that Gentleman therefore may please to take notice, that his Challenge being accepted, and what he desired being accordingly published, the Performance of his Promise is now expected; and an Assurance is hereby given him, that if the Author cannot return him an effectual Rejoinder, he will forthwith become his Profelyte, will confess his Obstinacy in defending Homilitical Non-resistance, and will thenceforward own himself a professed Whig.

ERRATA;

ERRATA in y^e 2^d Part.

PAge 29. l. 26. r. *aquus*. P. 58. l. 32. for de r. be.
P. 76. l. 27. r. haled. P. 81. l. 38. r. *Lactant. Instit.*
P. 87. l. 33. r. *ἐπιχειρηθῆναι*. P. 113. l. 1. for my
r. I. P. 135. l. 1. r. has. P. 148. l. 38. r. *Rigaltius*.
P. 217. l. 13. for to the point. r. to his purpose. P. 220.
l. 19. after the Queen's r. [or at other times, the King's.]
P. 239. l. 40. r. not to be for the good of some. P. 251.
l. 1. r. shews us far. P. 260. l. 9. r. a good. P. 262.
l. 7. and satisfied.

In the Letter.

PAge 1. l. 19. r. forbid. P. 2. l. 18. r. your own. P. 13.
l. 11. r. that the whole. P. 14. l. 23. r. irresistible.
P. 19. l. 35. read such Tyrants. P. 24. l. 11. for? r. .
L. 16. for any r. and. P. 26. l. 15. r. your Patriarch. P. 27.
l. 25. for this r. the. P. 29. l. 13. r. Adulterer. P. 36.
l. 2. r. Motions. P. 55. l. 35. r. or cause. Besides some
few Mistakes in the Crotchets.

Theſaurarium Mathematicæ:

OR THE

TREASURY

OF THE

MATHEMATICKS.

CONTAINING

Variety of useful Practices in *Arithmetick*,
Geometry, *Trigonometry*, *Astronomy*, *Geography*,
Navigation and *Surveying*.

AS ALSO

The Mensuration of *Board*, *Glass*, *Tiling*,
Paving, *Timber*, *Stone* and *Irregular Solids*.

LIKEWISE

It teacheth the Art of *Gauging*, *Dialling*, *Fortifi-*
cation, *Military-Orders* and *Gunnery*: Explains the *Loga-*
rishms, *Sines*, *Tangents*, and *Secants*: Sheweth their use in
Arithmetick, &c. To which is annex'd a Table of 10000
Logarithms, *Log-Sines* and *Log-Tangents*.

Illustrated with several *Mathematical Sculptures* on Copper-Plates.

Originally Compos'd by J. TAYLOR, Gent.

And now carefully Revis'd and Corrected.

To which is added, The Use and Practice of several *Proposi-*
tions and *Problems* throughout the whole Work, as also the Description and
Use of both *Globes*, and some of the chiefest *Mathematical Instruments* both
for Sea and Land. With many other considerable Additions and Improvements.

By *W. Alingham*, Teacher of the *Mathematicks*.

Printed by J. L. for *W. Freeman*, at the Bible against
the *Middle-Temple-Gate* in *Fleetstreet*. 1707.

Some BOOKS Printed for and Sold by
W. FREEMAN, *at the Bible in Fleet-street.*

There is newly Printed an Excellent Book, Entituled, *Arithmetick; Or the Ground of Arts, Teaching that Science both in Whole Numbers and Fractions: To which is added a New Treatise of Decimals, Tables of Simple and Compound Interest, &c.* By *Edward Hutton, Philomercat.* Price 5 s.

The Elements of *Euclid* Explain'd, in a New, but *most Easie Method*: By that Excellent Mathematician, *F. C. F. Milliet de Chalesy*, of the Society of *Jesus*: Now made English. Price 4 s.

A New Method of *Fortification*: By *Monfieur de Vauban*, Engineer-General of France. Done into English, and Illustrated with 32 Copper Plates. Price 6 s.

The *Gentleman's Dictionary*, Explaining all the Terms relating to the *Riding and Manage of the Great Horse*, the *Military Art, Artillery, &c.* The *Art of Navigation and Naval Affairs*. Written by the *Sieur Guillet*, and Dedicated to the *Dauphin*; With large Additions, Alterations and Improvements, and above Forty Cuts that were not in the Original. Price 5 s.

The *Compleat Horseman, or Perfect Farrier*; In Two Parts. I. Discovering the surest Marks of the Beauty, Goodness and Imperfections of Horses, the best Method of Breeding Colts, making their Mouths, Dieting and Ordering of Horses. Part II. Contains the Signs and Causes of their Diseases, and the best Method of Curing them. Written in *French* by the *Sieur de Sollysell*, Querry to the present *French King*, and one of the *Royal Academy of Paris*. Abridg'd from the *Folio* done into English, by *Sir William Hope*; With large Additions, and Directions to the Buyers and Sellers of Horses, in 8^o. Price 5 s.

A *Compleat Guide for Justices of the Peace*, In Two Parts; Continued down to the End of the Last Sessions of *Parliament*, 1706. With large Additions and Improvements, and Two Orders of Sessions, One for Limiting the Wages of several Artificers, Labourers, Servants and Husbandmen; The other for Setling the Rates to be given to Carriers for Carriage of Goods, &c. never before Printed in any Book of this Kind. By *J. W.* of the *Middle-Temple*, Barrister. Price 6 s.

BOOKS Sold by W. Freeman.

The Laws against *Bankrupts* Explain'd, by several Cases, Resolutions, Judgments and Decrees both at *Common Law* and in *Chancery*; With Directions for Commissioners and Precedents, fit for the Perusal of Lawyers, Merchants and Tradesmen: By *Tho. Goodinge*, Serjeant at Law. Price 5 s.

Systema Horti-culture; Or the Art of Gardening: In Three Books. Treating of the Excellency, Situation, Soil, Walks, &c. and other Ornaments of Gardens; With many Rules and Directions concerning the same. Of Winter-Greens, Flowers, &c. of the Kitchen-Garden; With Instructions for making Hot-Beds, altering and enriching any sort of Garden-Ground, &c. to a very great Improvement of every sort of Land for Use and Profit, Ornament and Delight. Illustrated with Sculptures. The Fourth Edition: By *J. Worlidge*, Gent. Price 2 s. 6 d.

The *Devout Communicant* Exemplified in his Behaviour, Before, At, and After the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; Practically suited to all the Parts of that solemn Ordinance. The Ninth Edition. Price 1 s. 6 d.

The *Whole Duty of a Christian*: Containing all things necessary, both as to what He is to Know and Do for obtaining a Happy Eternity. Price 1 s. 6 d.

An *Infallible Way to Contentment*; In Two Parts Compleat. Price 2 s.

An *Exposition of the Church-Catechism*, with Scripture-Proofs in Words at Length. The Second Edition. Pr. 1 s. 6 d.

The *Church of England's Communicant*, Directed and Assisted by the Publick Liturgy, in 24^o. Price 6 d.

The *Terrible Stormy Wind and Tempest*, which hapned Nov. 27. 1703. Consider'd, and ought to be had in Everlasting Remembrance; To which is added *Fair Warning to a Careless World*. Price 6 d. These Six were all Written by the Author of the *Devout Communicant*.

A Discourse concerning the *Certainty of a Future and Immortal State*. In some Moral, Physiologick and Religious Considerations. By a *Doctor of Physick*. Price 2 s. 6 d.

A *Manual of Private Devotions*, with Directions for the Sick: By the Right Reverend Father in God, *L. Andrews*, Late Bishop of Winchester. Price 1 s. 6 d.

New Observations on the Natural History of this World of Matter, and this World of Life; Being a Philosophical Discourse, grounded upon the *Mosaick System of the Creation and the Flood*; With some Thoughts concerning *Paradise, the Conflagration of the World, a Treatise of Meteorology, and*
some

BOOKS Sold by W. Freeman.

some Occasional Remarks upon some late *Theories, Conferences and Essays.* Price 2 s. 6 d.

The *Anatomy of the Earth*, in 4°. Price 6 d. These Two were Written by *Tho. Robinson*, Rector of *Ousby* in *Cumberland*.

A Discourse of *Natural and Reveald Religion.* By *Mr. T. Nourse*, in 8°. Price 2 s. 6 d.

The *Law of Nature and Nations*: Written Originally in Latin by *S. Puffendorf*, Councillor of State to the late King of *Sweden*. Done into English by *Mr. Kennett*. In Folio. Price 1 l.

A *Compleat History of England*, from before the Conquest to the Death of King *William the Third*; With the *Effigies* of all the Kings and Queens, Curiously done by the best Hands. In Three Volumes, Folio.

The *Whole Critical Works* of *Monsieur Rapin*, In Two Volumes: Done into English by several Hands. Price 12 s.

The *Compleat Body of Surgery* by *Vaugion*, In 8°. Price 6 s.

The *Compleat Surgeon*, with a Treatise of Bandages, and many Copper Cuts: By *Monsieur Le Clerc*. Price 4 s. 6 d.

The *Anatomy of Humane Bodies* Improv'd, according to the *Circulation* of the *Blood*, and all the Modern Discoveries: By *Monsieur Dinnis*, Chief Surgeon to the late *Dauphiness*, and the present *Dutchess of Burgundy*: Done into English and Illustrated with Figures. Price 6 s.

The *Roman History*, In Four Volumes *Compleat.* Pr. 1 l.

Charron of Wisdom: Done into English by the Reverend *Dr. Stanhope*, Dean of *Canterbury*. In Two Volumes.

Quarles's Emblems, a Curious Edition thereof. Price 5 s.

Steps of Ascension to God: By the Famous Cardinal *Belarmine*. Done into English and Reformed, by the Reverend *Mr. Hall of Hampstead*. Price 2 s. 6 d.

A *New Voyage to the Levant*. Price 5 s.

A *New Voyage to Italy*, In Two Volumes. Price 12 s.

A *New High German Grammar*: By *Mr. King*, Master of that Language in *London*. Price 2 s.

Miege's Last and Best French Grammar, In 8°. Price 2 s.

— His *Grammar for Foreigners to Learn English* Pr. 2 s.

A *New Treatise of Arithmetick*: In Three Parts. The *First*, Containing all the Common Rules of *Arithmetick*, in *Whole Numbers and Fractions*, both *Vulgar and Decimal*. The *Second*, The *Demonstration* of those Rules. The *Third*, The *Use and Application* of it in the *Exchequer, Custom-House, Excise, Pay-Offices, &c.* With some *Practical Rules, Notes and Questions* not hitherto Published. By *W. Alingharn*, Teacher of the *Mathematicks*. In 8°.



add ad p. 30. of y^e Letter. Mr. Hooker is expro^{ss}
against Resistance, ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~body~~ ^{body} May a
Body Politick then at all Times withdraw in
whole or in Part y^e Influence of Dominion w^{ch}
it hath from it, if Inconveniences do grow there-
by? It must be presumed, that Supreme Gov-
ernours will not in such Cases oppos^e y^e maj^{ty},
or be stiff in detaining that, y^e is wh^{ch} is
of publick Detriment: But surely with-
out their CONSENT I see not how the Body
by any JUST means sh^d be able to help it-
self, saving when Dominion doth of-
fer to cheat. Such Things therefore must be
thought upon beforehand, that Power may
be limited ere it be granted." Eccles.
Polity Book VIII. §. 2.



